Vigiliae Christianae

A Review of Early Christian Life and Language

VOLUME LV

BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON • KÖLN
2001

SWETS
BACKSETS SERVICE
Reprinted with permission of Brill Academic Publishers-Leiden by
SWETS & ZEITLINGER BV
LISSE - THE NETHERLANDS - 2004
www.swets.nl/backsets

VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

LV

Editors-in-chief

J. den Boeft, Amsterdam
R. van den Broek, Utrecht
W.L. Petersen, State College, Pennsylvania
D.T. Runia, Leiden
J.C.M. van Winden, Leiden

Associate Editors

A. Le Boulluec (Paris) – A. Davids (Nijmegen) – R.M. Grant (Chicago) –
Marguerite Harl (Paris) – J.-P. Mahé (Paris) – J. van Oort (Utrecht) –
Elaine Pagels (Princeton) G. Rouwhorst (Utrecht) – R. Staats (Kiel)

© Copyright 2001 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

ISSN 0042-6032

CONTENTS

I Articles

A. Alcock, The Sale of Mani 99

F.B.A. Asiedu, The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism 299

V. Buchheit, Patristischer Hintergrund im 12. Geistlichen Lied des Novalis 208

A.G. Cooper, Maximus the Confessor on the Structural Dynamics of Revelation 161

A. Dearn, The *Passio S. Typasii Veterani* as a Catholic Construction of the Past 86

A.D. DeConick, The True Mysteries. Sacramentalism in the *Gospel of Philip* 225

N.F. Denzey, Genesis Traditions in Conflict?: The Use of Some Exegetical Traditions in the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Johannine Prologue 20

Th. C.K. Ferguson, The Rule of Truth and Irenaean Rhetoric in Book 1 of *Against Heresies* 356

N.I. Fredrikson, L'esprit saint et les esprits mauvais dans le *Pasteur* d'Hermas: sources et prolongements 262

Th. Gärtner, Zur christlichen Imitationstechnik in der 'Vita Sancti Martini' des Paulinus von Petricordia 71

M. De Groote, Die Kirchenväter in Oecumenius' *Scholia in Iohannem Chrysostomum* 191

J. Holzhausen, Irenäus und die Valentinianische Schule. Zur *Praefatio* von *Adv. Haer.* 1 341

A. Kotzé, Reading Psalm 4 to the Manicheans 119

E. Lucchesi, La Légende d'Eudoxie et du Saint Sépulcre dans un Papyrus Copte de Berlin 427

Th. F. Martin, *Psalmus Gratiae Dei*: Augustine's "Pauline" Reading of *Psalm 31* 137

W. Mayer, Patronage, Pastoral Care and the Role of the Bishop at Antioch 58

A. Meis, Die Theologische Bedeutung des ὁμοχρόνως: zu *Adversus Arium et Sabellium* von [Gregor von Nyssa] 406

T. Nicklas, Erzähler und Charakter zugleich. Zur literarischen Funktion des „Petrus" in dem nach ihm benannten Evangelienfragment 318
A. Orlov and A. Golitzin, "Many Lamps are Lightened from the One": Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in Macarian Homilies 281
L. Perrone, Prayer in Origen's *Contra Celsum*: The Knowledge of God and the Truth of Christianity 1
A. Piras, Fulgentius von Ruspe, *Epist.* 13,3: *Thapsensis* oder *Tharrensis?* 156
H. Schneider, Thekla und die Robben 45
P. Schüngel, Das Valentinreferat des Irenäus von Lyon (*Haer* I, 11,1) 376
D. Woods, The Church of "St." Acacius at Constantinople 201
Y.N. Youssef, Un complément de l'Asceticon Copte de l'Abbé Isaïe 187

II Reviews

Aerts, W.J. & G.A.A. Kortekaas (Hgg.), *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius* (K-H. Utheman) 440
Allen, P., W. Mayer & L. Cross (eds.)., *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, Volume 2 (H.G. Schipper) 107
Arweiler, Alexander, *Die Imitation antiker und spätantiker Literatur in der Dichtung 'De spiritualis historiae gestis' des Alcimus Avitus* (H.G. Schipper) 216
Avit de Vienne, *Histoire spirituelle. Tome I (Chants I-III)* (H.G. Schipper) 216
Borgen, Peder, *Philo of Alexandria. An Exegete for His Time* (A.C. Geljon) 447
Borgen, P., K. Fuglseth & R. Skarten, *The Philo Index. A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria* (A.C. Geljon) 215
Bremmer, J.N., *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter. Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism* (C. Markschies) 333
Clement d'Alexandrie, *Les Stromates. Stromate VI* (E. Osborn) 430
DeConick, April D., *Voices of Mystics. Early Christian Discource in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature* (G. Quispel) 436
De Groote, M. (Hg.), *Oecumenii commentarius in Apocalypsin* (K-H. Utheman) 442
Fernandez, S., *Cristo Médico, según Orígenes. La actividad médica como metáfora de la acción divina* (D.T. Runia) 327

FRANK, G., *The Memory of the Eyes. Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity* (J.W. Drijvers) 222
FRANKFURTER, D., *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (S. Richter) 328
GOULET, R. (éd.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Tome 3, d'Eccélos à Juvénal (D.T. Runia) 221
GRANT, R.M., *Early Christians and Animals* (F. Ledegang) 110
HEUSER, M. & H-J. KLIMKEIT, *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art* (S.N.C. Lieu) 218
Das Martyrium des Polykarp, übersetzt und erklärt von Gerd Buschmann (B. Dehandschutter) 101
MCGOWAN, A., *Ascetic Eucharists. Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (G. Rouwhorst) 431
SULPICE SÉVÈRE, *Chroniques* (H.G. Schipper) 109
Torchia, N.J., *'Creatio ex nihilo' and the Theology of St. Augustine. The Anti-Manichean Polemic and Beyond* (J.A. van den Berg) 111
WEIDMANN, F.W., *Polycarp & John. The Harris Fragments and Their Challenge to the Literary Tradition* (B. Dehandschutter) 104

Books Received 114, 337, 450

PRAYER IN ORIGEN'S *CONTRA CELSUM*: THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD AND THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY

BY

LORENZO PERRONE

"So tun sie alle, alle, Christen und Heiden".

(Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Widerstand und Ergebung*)

No monographic treatment, as far as I know, has been devoted to prayer in Origen's *Contra Celsum* (= *CC*), perhaps out of the conviction that this topic is not really a major issue among the many that this great apology of Christianity has raised.[1] At first sight one is tempted to share such a conviction, especially when faced with the main lines of the debate between Celsus and Origen as they have been discussed in the course of more than a century of research.[2] Yet prayer is not only an important aspect of Origen's life and work—as is shown by his treatise *Perì euchês* (= *PE*) and by the wealth of references to this subject throughout his other writings—but also a central feature of all religious systems. We may therefore ask to what extent Origen's invaluable presentation of prayer, whose most revealing traits are to be found especially in *PE*, is further corroborated by *CC*, or whether the perspective here is essentially determined by the necessity of responding to pagan criticisms, so that in a sense we miss the deepest Christian substance deployed by Origen in the treatise.[3] On

[1] For a survey of the most recent studies, see A. Le Boulluec, "Vingt ans de recherche sur le *Contre Celse*. État des lieux", in L. Perrone (ed.), *Discorsi di verità. Paganesimo, giudaismo e cristianesimo a confronto nel* Contro Celso *di Origene* (Roma, 1998), pp. 9-28.

[2] Among the new contributions dealing with important themes of *CC*, mention should be made of M. Fédou, *Christianisme et religions païennes dans le* Contre Celse *d'Origène* (Paris, 1988), and of C. Reemts, *Vernunftgemäßer Glaube. Die Begründung des Christentums in der Schrift des Origenes gegen Celsus* (Bonn, 1998).

[3] The problem of congruity with Origen's view of prayer in *PE* is not altogether restricted to *CC*, since scholars sometimes miss it also in the homilies (see W. Völker, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit und zu*

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

the other hand, we can reasonably expect prayer to be in any case, for both participants in the dispute, a sensitive indicator of their respective religious tradition, providing us with an important test of its contents and values. In both respects then *CC* deserves a comprehensive examination, which I shall try to outline in my contribution.

I. *Evidence of Prayer in* Contra Celsum

The topic of prayer occurs several times in Origen's prolonged controversy with the pagan philosopher, so that when we try to summarize it, we have to deal with a wide range of issues. These are not all immediately conditioned by an obligatory "comparative" approach, as is proved by their occurrence elsewhere in Origen's writings, though of course in *CC* the urgency of the religious competition between paganism and Christianity is always likely to be felt. We may therefore try to order the evidence under two principal headings: first, prayer as the experience of the author himself and Christians like him, and as a more general practice of men; secondly, how Origen compares the Christian way of praying with that of the pagans, in his effort to demonstrate the superiority of the former against the different expressions of the latter.

Prayer as invocation for divine knowledge and spiritual progress

In a series of short but eloquent passages the author of *CC* himself prays, and reflects upon prayer as the experience of Christians. While pursuing his great literary enterprise, and in conformity with the habit he displays in his other writings, Origen calls for divine assistance, normally at the beginning of a book, though not in every case.[4] As he repeatedly asserts, only God can bestow upon him the understanding and the powerful arguments needed to successfully counter the accusations of Celsus.[5] As we can

---

den Anfängen christlicher Mystik [Tübingen, 1931] and W. Gessel, *Die Theologie des Gebetes nach "De oratione" von Origenes* [München-Paderborn-Wien, 1975]). I have dealt with this question in "La prière des chrétiens selon Origène", in G. Dorival—D. Pralon (edd.), *Prières méditerranéennes et d'ailleurs* (forthcoming).

[4] The exceptions are Books 2, 3 and 6. Regarding the presence of introductory prayers in Origen's works, see for example *PE* 2, 6 and the witness of the homilies: D. Sheerin, "The role of prayer in Origen's homilies", in C. Kannengiesser—W.L. Petersen (edd.), *Origen of Alexandria. His World and His Legacy* (Notre Dame, 1988), pp. 200-214.

[5] See, for instance, *CC* 4, 1, 1-29; 5, 1, 24-25; 7, 1, 5-8; 8, 1, 14-16 (quotations are based on the edition of M. Borret: *Origène. Contre Celse*, I-V [SC 132, 136, 147, 150,

see from the prologue to Book 4, Origen's prayer reflects the essential needs stemming from his apologetic task. Despite his initial reluctance to take up this challenge, as he unmistakably declares to Ambrose in the preface to *CC*, Origen here presents it with the words of Jer. 1,9-10, a passage he often cited to describe the dialectic of God's relations with men within his salvific *oikonomia*: through divine inspiration, the prophet is given mighty words first to "eradicate" and then to "plant". Origen thus prays God that his confutation of Celsus' arguments, after their destruction, will be followed by the creation of a new Christian mind in those who had fallen under their influence.[6] Both here and elsewhere Origen's prayer characteristically concerns the intelligence of truth: it is mainly a request for divine knowledge to support his whole endeavour. In this sense he pleads for inspiration from God,[7] and for the illumination of truth in his own heart.[8]

These introductory prayers conform both in content and formulation to the normative pattern drawn by Origen in *PE*, where he puts forward the demand for spiritual things as the model for those who want to live in Christ and in the Spirit, while insisting that prayer should be addressed to God the Father through Christ.[9] Further evidence in *CC* supports our first impression about what and how one has to ask in prayer. There are

---

227: Paris, 1967-1976], with indication of book, chapter and line, while the translation occasionally provided is taken from *Origen: Contra Celsum*, transl. with Introd. and Notes by H. Chadwick, Cambridge 1953).

[6] *CC* 4, 1, 20-29: Εἶτ' ἐπεὶ μὴ χρὴ καταλήγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ «ἐκριζοῦν καὶ κατασκάπτειν» τὰ προειρημένα ἀλλ' εἰς μὲν τὴν χώραν τῶν ἐκριζωθέντων «καταφυτεύειν» φυτείαν τοῦ κατὰ θεὸν γεωργίου, εἰς δὲ τὸν τόπον τῶν κατασκαφέντων οἰκοδομεῖν θεοῦ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ ναὸν δόξης θεοῦ, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμῖν εὐκτέον ἐστὶ τῷ δεδωκότι κυρίῳ τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἱερεμίᾳ γεγραμμένα, ἵνα καὶ ἡμῖν δῷ λόγους καὶ πρὸς τὸ οἰκοδομεῖν τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ «καταφυτεύειν» τὸν πνευματικὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς ἀνάλογον αὐτῷ προφητικοὺς λόγους. For Origen's interpretation of the prophet's vocation as implied by Jer. 1, 9-10, see *HomIer* 1, 6-7.

[7] *CC* 5, 1, 24-25: Θεὸς δὲ δῴη μὴ ψιλῷ καὶ γυμνῷ θειότητος τῷ ἡμετέρῳ νῷ καὶ λόγῳ <πρὸς> τὸ προκείμενον γενέσθαι, "may God grant that we may not come to the task with our mind and reason merely human and without any divine inspiration" (p. 264).

[8] *CC* 7, 1, 5-8: θεὸν ἐπικαλεσάμενοι δι' αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ κατηγορουμένου ὑπὸ Κέλσου, ἵν' ἡμῶν ἐλλάμψῃ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἀλήθεια τυγχάνων τὰ ἀνατρεπτικὰ τοῦ ψεύδους, "after calling on God through that same Jesus Christ who is accused by Celsus, asking that, as he is the truth, he may cause to shine in our hearts the arguments which can successfully refute the falsehood" (p. 395).

[9] Cf. respectively *PE* 17, 2 (prayer for celestial gifts); 13, 4 (prayer as expression of the life in Christ and the Spirit) and 10, 2 (the Father as the proper addressee of prayer). I have stressed the idea of a "spiritual prayer" as the most adequate category for understanding Origen's model in *PE* (see "La prière des chrétiens selon Origène", *supra*, n. 3).

requests pointing to what is Origen's continuous *medium* of thought and the almost exclusive field of his whole literary activity: the comprehension of the hidden meaning of the Scriptures. Once more he recalls the situation of the prophets pleading for the revelation of the secret sense of the word of God, as in Ps. 118, 18 ("open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law").[10] This verse is frequently adopted by Origen as a hermeneutic motif in order to reach beyond the letter of the Bible and to introduce us to its deeper meaning. To this effect divine help is needed to remove the "veil" lying on our heart (2 Cor. 3, 15-16), another image often recurring in his writings and associated with the closed eyes as a hermeneutic device.[11] Not surprisingly we find it also in *CC*: only by praying God without intermission, according to Ps. 118, 18, can one hope that he will remove the veil, thus permitting the eyes of man to see.[12] Prayer functions here as a preliminary requisite which stresses at once the necessity of recourse to God's grace and the involvement on the part of man, which in its turn has to be performed as best he can. We may thus catch here more than a simple echo of the demanding and paradoxical view of prayer expressed by Origen in *PE*, which makes of it a rather problematic experience. Indeed it becomes possible as an authentic experience only if God comes to compensate the constitutive human weakness through the assistance of the Spirit.[13]

Origen's polemical debate with Celsus is not comparable to direct exegesis of biblical texts, though typical habits of the exegete support his meticulous reply to the pagan's criticisms and the recourse to Scripture is always at hand even in *CC*. This may explain why instances of prayer for the understanding of Scripture are less frequent than elsewhere, when Origen is systematically commenting upon the text of the Bible, incidentally con-

---

[10] *CC* 2, 6, 13-16: εὐχόμενοι περὶ τοῦ νόμου ὡς ἀσαφοῦς καὶ δεομένου θεοῦ, ἵνα νοηθῇ, λέγουσιν ἐν εὐχῇ· «Ἀποκάλυψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσιά σου ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου.» See also *CC* 4, 50, 1-12; 7, 34, 15-23.

[11] For instance, both Ps. 118, 18 and 2 Cor. 3, 15 figure in *HomGen.* 12, 1. Origen's exploitation of the pauline verse for his pneumatic interpretation has been analyzed by F. Cocchini, *Il Paolo di Origene. Contributo alla storia della recenzione delle epistole paoline nel III sec.* (Roma, 1992), pp. 143-146.

[12] *CC* 4, 50, 7-12: ὅπερ «κάλυμμα περιαιρεῖται» τοῦ θεοῦ δωρουμένου, ἐπὰν ἐπακούσῃ τῷ παρ' ἑαυτὸν πάντα ποιήσαντι καὶ διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γυμνάσαντι πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ συνεχέστατα φήσαντι· «Ἀποκάλυψον . . .».

[13] For this evaluation, see my analysis of *PE*: "Il discorso protrettico di Origene sulla preghiera. Introduzione al ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΧΗΣ", in F. Cocchini (ed.), *Il dono e la sua ombra. Ricerche sul* ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΧΗΣ *di Origene* (Roma, 1997), pp. 7-32, esp. 7-11.

ferring on prayer a structural relevance for his own undertaking.[14] Nevertheless the positive configuration of prayer as invocation of divine knowledge and spiritual progress, implied by the passages we have just examined, receives additional support from other texts of similar content. Occasional mention is made of prayer for the gift of the Spirit, once again as a pre-condition to knowing "the things of God", and thus to becoming his sons.[15] Relying on 2 Cor. 4, 6 (the light shining from the glory of God) and Rom. 8, 14 (the guide of the Spirit), Origen restates his approach, according to which access to God and his truth is provided only by God, in response to prayer.

Of the same kind is the request for purification of the heart, the organ the Bible regards as especially well-suited to the contemplation of God, provided that it is not defiled. Such a theme, apart from its occurrence in the quotation of 2 Cor. 3, 15 which we have already seen, is also claimed by other contexts and as a consequence of the quotation of Ps. 50, 12 ("create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me") and Mt. 5, 8 (the beatitude of the pure of heart). To answer Celsus' criticism of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection, which he polemically connects with the idea that Christians would pretend to see God through their own body, Origen emphasizes the prayer for a spiritual organ: Christians demand a "purified heart", which is not bound to flesh, but is created by God to ensure a vision of a spiritual kind.[16] Recourse to prayer is again justified by Origen as a direct implication of human inadequacy

---

[14] This is of course the case first of all of the homilies. See Sheerin (*supra*, n. 4) and my introduction to *HomGen*: "Introduzione: 'Mosè ci viene letto nella Chiesa'", in E. Dal Covolo—L. Perrone (edd.), *Mosè ci viene letto nella Chiesa. Lettura delle Omelie di Origene sulla Genesi* (Roma, 1999), pp. 11-31, esp. 11-15.

[15] *CC* 4, 95, 21-25: Εὐχόμεθα δὲ λάμψαι «ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν» τὸν «φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ» (2 Cor. 4, 6), ἐπιδημοῦντος ἡμῶν τῷ φανταστικῷ πνεύματος θεοῦ καὶ φαντάζοντος ἡμᾶς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐπεὶ «Ὅσοι πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοί εἰσι θεοῦ» (Rom. 8, 14), "but we pray that there may shine in our hearts the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, by the Spirit of God dwelling in our imagination and representing to us the things of God. 'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God'" (p. 259). The close context is given by the vindication of God-inspired prophecy both for the old and the new people of God in contrast with pagan divination. A further hint at prayer for the gift of the Spirit occurs at *CC* 8, 22, 21-25, where Origen describes the condition of the Christian in analogy with that of the apostles before Pentecost.

[16] *CC* 7, 33, 11-14: Τὸ γὰρ γινῶσκον θεὸν οὐκ ὀφθαλμός ἐστι σώματος ἀλλὰ νοῦς, ὁρῶν τὸ «κατ' εἰκόνα» τοῦ κτίσαντος καὶ τὸ δυνάμενον γινώσκειν θεὸν προνοίᾳ θεοῦ ἀνειληφώς. Καὶ τὸ ὁρῶν δὲ θεὸν καθαρά ἐστι καρδία.

in the face of divine knowledge.[17] Making one's own the words of Ps. 50, 12, out of a conscious attitude of prayer (a practical "science" which *PE* especially recommends), means actually to realize the essentials of the relationship between man and God. Man cannot himself lay claim to divine knowledge, but has to be created anew by God (though not without his own cooperation) in order to reach it. Prayer then coherently reflects this state of things, in which man understands he is a needful creature, while it points at the same time to the dynamics of spiritual transformation.[18]

The prayer of Jesus

The image of prayer that we have so far seen from *CC* at first sight takes on a different emphasis, when we consider Jesus' supplication to the Father at the moment of his agony in Gethsemane (Mk. 14, 35-36; Mt. 26, 37-38; Lk. 22, 41-45), a test case against him brought forth by the fictitious Jew, whom Celsus uses as spokesman in the first two books.[19] The criticism he raises is about the content of Jesus' prayer, since it appears to be not so much a demand for spiritual goods as a request for liberation from death, out of fear of it.[20] If so conceived, Jesus' demand would

---

[17] *CC* 7, 33, 19-23: ἐπεὶ δ' οὐκ αὐτάρκης ἡ ἡμετέρα προαίρεσις πρὸς τὸ πάντῃ «καθαρὰν» ἔχειν τὴν «καρδίαν», ἀλλὰ θεοῦ ἡμῖν δεῖ, κτίζοντος αὐτὴν τοιαύτην, διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπιστημόνως εὐχομένου· «Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ θεός».

[18] *CC* 7, 45, 6-11: against Celsus' opinion, Christians are not at all bound to the flesh, inasmuch as they even strive to free themselves from every evil thought—τοὺς πειρωμένους μηδὲ μέχρι τῶν λογισμῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων τῆς κακίας μολύνεσθαι καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ λέγοντας· «Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πνεῦμα εὐθὲς ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις μου», ἵνα τῇ μόνῃ πεφυκυίᾳ βλέπειν θεὸν «καρδίᾳ καθαρᾷ» θεασώμεθα αὐτόν, "though we try to avoid being defiled by the lusts of evil even in our thoughts, and say in our prayer 'Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within my being', in order that we may see God with a pure heart which alone has the power to see Him" (p. 433). The motive of the "pure heart" is closely woven into Origen's description of man's spiritual accomplishment in *CC* 8, 18, 3: by seeing the Logos, the image of the Creator, those of a "pure heart" build their own inner statue, thus becoming "imitators of God".

[19] *CC* 2, 24-25. Also this point could be brought into the discussion about the real or fictitious character of the *prosôpopoiia* of the Jew, though in my opinion it rather supports the latter. For the two contrary responses, see respectively L. Troiani, "Il giudeo di Celso", in L. Perrone (ed.), *Discorsi di verità* . . ., pp. 115-128; and E. Norelli, "La tradizione sulla nascita di Gesù nell' Ἀληθὴς λόγος di Celso", *ibid.*, pp. 133-166.

[20] *CC* 2, 24, 3-5: Τί οὖν ποτνιᾶται καὶ ὀδύρεται καὶ τὸν τοῦ ὀλέθρου φόβον εὔχεται παραδραμεῖν. Surprisingly enough, this episode does not figure among the Gospel passages commented upon in *PE*, not even in the explanation of the third demand of the

indeed miss the normative pattern recommended by *PE*: in the words of the treatise, it would be a prayer not for the true "gifts" but for their "shadow";[21] besides that, Origen himself criticizes those members of the Christian community who, on becoming ill and expecting death, beg God to be kept alive.[22] Yet Celsus' interpretation of the Gospel story, in Origen's eyes, is misled by his incorrect polemical method, which meant cutting out half of the sentence formulated by Jesus and therefore overlooking the true disposition of his soul. If we take into account the whole text, the pattern of the "spiritual prayer" again comes to the fore.

The way Jesus prays, on the one hand, adequately expresses his submission to the Father's plan for humankind and by implication can represent as such a model for Christians, who should similarly surrender themselves to the will of God;[23] on the other hand, this model wholly corresponds to the condition of man on his path towards salvation, inasmuch as prayer is brought forth in the midst of the fight between "spirit" and "flesh". Jesus' supplication manifests his humanity and describes the way to prayer through the weakness of the flesh and the willingness of the spirit.[24] One

---

Lord's Prayer, while Origen refers to it in *ExM* 29. For the fear of death as a behaviour not conforming to philosophical standards of personal conduct, see the episode of the philosopher's anguish in face of the impending shipwreck which is narrated by Aulus Gellius (*Noct. Att.* 19, 1) and retold by Augustine (*Quaest. in Gen.*, 30; *De civ. Dei* 9, 4, 2-3).

[21] See *PE* 16, 2.

[22] *HomIer.* 17, 6.

[23] As for Jesus' spiritual dispositions, see *CC* 2, 24, 15-16: τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ μεγαλοψυχίαν; ll. 18-19: τὴν πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τοῦ πατρὸς περὶ τῶν κεκριμένων αὐτὸν παθεῖν εὐπείθειαν; ll. 41-42: τὴν Ἰησοῦ πρὸς τὸ πάθος παρασκευὴν καὶ εὐτονίαν. The virtues of "true devotion" (εὐσέβεια), "noble-mindedness" (μεγαλοψυχία), "ready obedience" (εὐπείθεια), "preparation" (παρασκευή) and "good disposition" (εὐτονία), implied for Origen by Jesus' prayer, all confer on it the typical character of the spiritual prayer. *PE* 14, 2 summarizes it while distinguishing the different words for prayer: προσευχή "is that sent up with greater magnanimity by a man for greater gifts and accompanied by words of praise" (*Origen's Treatise on Prayer*, transl. E.G. Jay [London, 1954], p. 122). Regarding the terminology, we can here observe that *CC* is not consistent with the criteria established in *PE*, since εὐχή is used more often and its meaning is the same as προσευχή. On both terms see lately P. van Deun, "ΕΥΧΗ distingué de ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗ: un essai de précision terminologique chez les pères grecs et les écrivains byzantins", in J. den Boeft, M.L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk (eds.), *The Impact of Scripture in Early Christianity*, Leiden 1999, pp. 202-222, esp. 211-213.

[24] *CC* 2, 25, 7-9. For the tension between spirit and flesh as a mark of the human condition, particularly emerging at the moment of prayer, see *PE* 13, 4: πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ περὶ τῶν προπαρατεθέντων ἡμῖν πνευματικῶν καὶ μυστικῶν εὐχὴ ἀεὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ μὴ "κατὰ

is reminded again of the paradoxical note of the prologue to the treatise, dramatically insisting on the frailty of human condition with regard to the knowledge of God and the possibility of praying to him, because of the "corruptible body" and the "earthly tabernacle weighing down the mind" (Wisd. 9, 15).[25] The victory of the spirit over the resistant flesh in Jesus' agony makes of his prayer a paradigm to be followed by Christians, and it actually inspired the many martyrs who bore witness to their faith in this way with their own death.[26]

Prayer as the experience of men

With such considerations we approach a third set of evidence on prayer in *CC*. This has to do with how it is concretely practised by men, both pagan and Christian. We can still leave the controversial points aside for a little while, inasmuch as Origen here seems partly to regard prayer as an experience shared among different religious groups, but we are naturally getting nearer to the core of the polemical debate with the pagan philosopher, which will also involve our topic. Origen's ideal of prayer—as is clear from the preceding references to *CC*, all in line with the view expressed in *PE*—suggests its object is the "great and heavenly things" without troubling the Father with requests for "little and earthly things". Notwithstanding that, Origen does not deny the right to demand even earthly goods: both pagans and Christians do this, for instance when they pray to have children, though pagans falsely rely on demons, while Christians appeal to the Creator of the universe.[27]

In his treatise Origen had also set a model for the structural elements

---

σάρκα" στρατευομένου ἀλλὰ "πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος" θανατοῦντος ἐπιτελεῖται (ed. P. Koetschau [GCS 3: Leipzig 1899, p. 328, 8-10]).

[25] *PE* 1, 1. See also *ibid.* 2, 4.

[26] *CC* 2, 25, 36-37. In 2, 25, 23-33, Origen provides a further explanation, according to which Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane is a prayer of intercession on behalf of Jerusalem and its inhabitants to avoid the divine punishment after his death.

[27] *CC* 8, 46. Origen draws his lesson for a spiritual prayer from an *agraphon* he quotes in *PE* 2, 2 and alludes to in 13, 4; 17, 2; 33, 1 as also in *CC* 7, 44: "Ask for the great things, and the small things shall be added unto you; and, Ask for heavenly things, and earthly things shall be added unto you" (*PE* 2, 2 = transl. Jay, p. 82). Origen addresses the issue of earthly benefits as a result of fulfilled prayer with the "paradigms of salvation" in the Old Testament. He submits them to a spiritual exegesis in order to establish the pattern he has put forward, but his effort is not devoid of tensions, as I tried to prove in "I paradigmi biblici della preghiera nel *Peri Euchês* di Origene. Aspetti formali e problematiche ermeneutiche", in *Augustinianum* 33 (1993), pp. 339-368.

of prayer (τόποι), starting with the initial praise of God and proceeding to the final praise through thanksgiving, confession of sins and demand for "great and heavenly things", these elements being further illustrated with the help of examples taken from the Scriptures.[28] More generally, the formulation of prayers should follow in the footsteps of the language of the Bible, which is full—as Origen says—of truly "spiritual prayers".[29] However, despite the importance given to such a norm, he knows very well that concrete reality looks quite different from his ideal: the majority of believers when praying don't know the names which the Scriptures attribute to God.[30] So Christians tend to resemble once more the pagans here too, though the prayers they make, in all kinds of tongues and dialects, are answered by the Lord of every tongue and dialect who hears them as one language.

If pagans and Christians beg for earthly things, for Origen prayer is nevertheless aimed at procuring man a "better life" than the merely physical one. Instead of praying for their health, men (again both Christians and pagans) are invited to address themselves to the care of doctors, while Christians are expected to obtain from God, thanks to their "true devotion" and to their prayers to him, a better form of existence.[31] On the other hand, one should notice once more how this ideal model is meant by Origen for those who wish to distinguish themselves from the "multitude", i.e. the Christians who through the "spiritual prayer" are committed to the demanding road to perfection. This tension towards spiritual fulfilment always accompanies Origen's reflection on prayer, from *PE* to *CC*, even when he apologetically pleads the cause of the simple Christians against Celsus' criticisms, as we shall soon see.[32] Therefore, as a provisional conclusion of our first section, we may state that even in *CC* Origen largely depends on the model established in *PE*. It is precisely because of its intrinsic character that prayer is called on to play a significant role in the debate between pagans and Christians.

---

[28] *PE* 33, 1-6.

[29] *Ibid.*, 2, 5. See *supra* n. 27 for the problems posed by the exploitation of the biblical paradigms as "spiritual prayers".

[30] *CC* 8, 37.

[31] *CC* 8, 60, 30-32.

[32] "L'accent porte ainsi sur la transformation morale et spirituelle, liée à l'authentique prière dont elle manifeste les fruits" (Fédou, *Christianisme et religions païennes* . . ., p. 360).

II. *Prayer in the Debate between Pagans and Christians*

The superiority of Christian prayer

Prayer becomes an important issue in the dispute when Celsus towards the end of his Ἀληθὴς λόγος addresses the question of the traditional cult of the gods, reproaching the Christians because they refuse to associate themselves with it. From his point of view, the gods are demons to whom the transcendent God commits the government of the universe. Therefore one should pay homage to their statues, offer sacrifices and pray to them so that they may prove to be well-disposed to men.[33] For Origen, on the contrary, only God can be the proper addressee of prayer so as to obtain his benevolence to humankind, this being possible on the other hand through true devotion and the practice of virtue.[34] We may glimpse here the essentials of Origen's apologetic response to Celsus: his argument binds "true religion" (εὐσέβεια) to moral conduct so as to firmly establish for Christianity the value of prayer as a spiritual experience. At the same time both aspects prepare the ground for his vindication of the superiority of Christian over pagan prayer. With this in mind, Origen is explicit as to the limitations of religious comparativism when applied to prayer.

Actually prayer is a common experience both for pagans and for Christians, as is the case with other practices shared by different religious traditions like sacrifice or circumcision. But one should not be misled by the apparent analogies. As mentioned before, Origen certainly admits that the object of prayer can be the same.[35] Yet the point is to whom one addresses one's demand; to be answered, prayer must be presented to the right addressee: none other than God the Father, as Jesus Christ taught us, who refused to prostrate himself before the Devil.[36] Moreover, apart from the recognition of the "true religion", as with circumcision, to evaluate the significance of prayer and to compare it to the corresponding practice of paganism, one should weigh the whole complex of spiritual attitudes, norms and ideas which support the act of praying.[37] Within this perspective, for Origen

---

[33] *CC* 8, 24, 5-7. Cf. also *CC* 7, 62. 68. The relevance of prayer within public devotion is stressed by Fédou, *Christianisme et religions païennes* . . ., pp. 358-359.

[34] *CC* 8, 64, 1-3: "Ενα οὖν τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν ἡμῖν ἐξευμενιστέον καὶ τοῦτον ἵλεω εὐκτέον, ἐξευμενιζόμενον εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ πάσῃ ἀρετῇ.

[35] *CC* 5, 47, 4-5: ὁ εὐχόμενος οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ εὔχεται, εἰ καὶ τὰ αὐτά ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἀξιοῖ.

[36] *CC* 8, 56, 21-22: εὐχόμενοι μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ γίνεσθαι. See also 8, 20.

[37] *CC* 5, 47, 7-8: Ἡ γὰρ πρόθεσις καὶ ὁ νόμος καὶ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ περιτέμνοντος ἀλλοῖον ποιεῖ τὸ πρᾶγμα.

Christian prayer is consequently a different thing. His line of thought is clear and consistent, but we may wonder whether, because of the close confrontation with his pagan antagonist, he was eventually led to emphasize some aspects and values to which also Celsus was especially sensitive. We have then a further opportunity to verify how the model set up by Origen in *PE*, and previously confirmed also by some of the evidence collected in *CC*, can withstand the challenge of a philosophical polemic against Christianity. We shall see that *CC*, thanks precisely to such a dispute, will focus more deeply on prayer as knowledge of God, while also taking it to be a crucial proof of the truth of Christianity.

The prayer of the simple believers, the moral life and spiritual progress

For his goal of demonstrating the superiority of Christian prayer as an authentic spiritual experience, Origen has to defend even the more modest practice of the multitude. God actually accepts both the demands of the simple believers and those pronounced by the "more intelligent", who are able to unite εὐσέβεια with λόγος, and to present their requests with thanks to the Father through Christ.[38] The wiser Christians fully conform thus to the requirements of προσευχή as the prayer *par excellence*, as Origen proposed in his treatise.[39] Though distinguishing in this way between simple faith and rational religion, Origen energetically rejects Celsus' criticisms of the holders of the former, because in his eyes the pagan philosopher ignores their moral and religious merits: they are people who fight a spiritual battle in order that they may be of God. Even simple Christians should be considered, according to Origen, as people who are in the process of ascending to God.[40] The important distinction between the multitude and the few perfect people, when seen in the light of prayer, apparently does not imply a decisive difference. No one is excluded from the "ascent"

---

[38] *CC* 7, 46, 6-9: ἀποδεχόμενον ἰδιωτῶν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν πίστιν καὶ συνετωτέρων τὴν μετὰ λόγου εἰς αὐτὸν εὐσέβειαν, μετ' εὐχαριστίας ἐναπεμπόντων εὐχὰς τῷ δημιουργῷ τοῦ παντὸς καὶ ἀναπεμπόντων αὐτὰς ὡς δι' ἀρχιερέως τοῦ τὴν εἰλικρινῆ θεοσέβειαν ἀνθρώποις παραστήσαντος, "[the God of the universe], who approves the faith of common folk in Him and the rational piety towards Him of more intelligent people who send up their prayers to the Creator of the universe with thanksgiving, an offering of prayer which they make as by the mediation of a high priest who has shown to men the pure way to worship God" (p. 434).

[39] See *PE* 14, 2 and 33, 1, both exploiting 1 Tm. 2, 1.

[40] *CC* 7, 46, 16: ἀνθρώπους, εὐχομένους εἶναι θεοῦ; ll. 41-42: ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀίδιον δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ. See also 8, 53, 25-26: Christians are those who despise the idols so as to ascend to God with their intellect.

(ἀνάβασις) to God granted by the act of prayer, as will be shown shortly with the examination of *CC* 7, 44, the most revealing description of prayer to be found in the whole work.

But from the passage under examination we can draw further insight into the role prayer is expected to play within spiritual life. According to Origen's view we mentioned before, when dealing with the discussion on Jesus' agony in Gethsemane, prayer is born out of the "agonic" situation of man, which demands the force and the benefits of prayer to be kept under control and in the end to be overcome.[41] Prayer then becomes an essential factor of spiritual progress; its unequivocal sign is the quality of the moral life characterising the adherents of Christianity who perform it. We already know this argument, often exploited by Origen against Celsus' attacks and his pleading for a return to traditional cults,[42] but it is interesting to note how through it prayer is finally given the status of a major proof and mirror of Christianity as the true religion. Prayer expresses the purity of the Christian life submitted to the Logos and manifesting its adhesion to God precisely through the relationship it establishes with him. When they pray, Christians reject every passion or desire from their minds so as to pay their cult to God.[43] When they strive to be pure and totally devoted to God, prayer realizes the harmonious involvement of all the components of man, so that they pray not only with their "spirit" and "soul", but also with their "body"; and such a state of inner cohesion is rewarded with the help of God, through the gift of his Spirit.[44] In this way prayer sums up for Origen the whole purpose of Christian life: to "become familiar" with God and to be united with him through the Logos, his intermediary with man.[45]

---

[41] This feature has been rightly stressed by P.S.A. Lefeber, *Keuze en verlangen. Een onderzoek naar zin en functie van het gebed in Origenes' preken en zijn tractaat* Over het gebed (Gorinchem, 1997): "Prayer in Origen is above all characterised by a struggle to escape from this sinful existence to the reality of God. It is its very essence because in prayer willingness and unwillingness to turn to God are in mutual conflict" (p. 198).

[42] We feel its weight already at the beginning of the confutation: see *CC* 1, 9.

[43] *CC* 7, 48, 14-16; 8, 73, 32-33.

[44] *CC* 2, 51, 39-43. This passage should be considered together with, on the one hand, *PE* 9, 2 (where the "soul" is said to becoming totally "spiritual" at the moment of prayer) and, on the other hand, *PE* 31, 1 (the posture of the praying as the "icon" of his inner attitudes).

[45] *CC* 8, 64, 21-23: παντὶ δὲ τρόπῳ λόγων καὶ πράξεων σπεύδοντα οἰκειοῦσθαι καὶ ἑνοῦσθαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ διὰ τοῦ καταλύσαντος μυρίους δαίμονας Ἰησοῦ.

The act of prayer as knowledge of God

The final debate on the practice of traditional religion stresses the importance of Christian prayer as opposed to the pagan cult of demons. But Origen has recognized its utmost relevance in another context, while discussing Celsus' philosophical approach to the knowledge of God in Book 7. It is indeed a core issue for the whole dispute between the two, inasmuch as the pagan philosopher openly professes his deepest platonic inspiration by quoting the famous passage from the *Timaeus*, where Plato declares it a particularly laborious task to find out the Creator and the Father of the universe and, when found, the impossibility of communicating him to all men.[46] Yet Celsus, despite these difficulties, proposes three "ways" or methods of thinking in order to attain knowledge of the transcendent God, though these are of course accessible only to a few men philosophically trained.[47] Celsus indeed even goes a step further, since he apparently suggests a fourth way consisting of "some ineffable force", probably a kind of ecstatic intuition of God.[48] In conformity with that, Origen's antagonist shares with other representatives of middle Platonism the exciting perspective of "seeing God" as the highest aim of philosophy.[49]

Against this remarkable pattern of thought, Origen's response lets prayer emerge as the Christian "way" to the knowledge of God.[50] It is precisely this act which enables the *anabasis* to God to be accomplished both by the "simple" believers and by the "wise" ones. Instead of Celsus' restricted access to divinity, Origen is once more pleading for the universality of the Christian religion.[51] But when he describes how prayer should be performed, he comes quite near to invoking the same spiritual attitudes recommended by Celsus himself, thus conferring on his presentation of prayer in *CC* an unmistakably philosophical tone. There is first of all the emphasis placed on the act of praying as a process of detachment from the senses and of inner concentration: he who prays, closes the eyes of the body and opens those of his soul so as to proceed to an intellectual sight—the same

---

[46] Plato, *Tim.* 28 c; *CC* 7, 42.

[47] *Ibid.* (the three ways are: σύνθεσις, ἀνάλυσις, ἀναλογία). See A. Magris, "Platonismo e cristianesimo alla luce del *Contro Celso*", in L. Perrone (ed.), *Discorsi di verità* . . ., pp. 54ff.

[48] *CC* 7, 45. Cf. S. Lilla, *Introduzione al Medio platonismo* (Roma, 1992), pp. 80-81; and Magris, "Platonismo e cristianesimo . . .", p. 56.

[49] *CC* 7, 36.

[50] See *CC* 7, 44.

[51] *CC* 7, 44, 36-37: Χριστιανὸς δὲ καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης. This is clearly a major argument of Origen's defense. Within the present context, see also *CC* 7, 41.

condition Celsus himself previously required in order to see God.[52] Nevertheless, Origen's perspective also in *CC* consists of a complex of elements converging with this and other platonic *topoi*, and eventually resulting in a different conception of the "vision" of God that combines both philosophical and biblical motifs.

It is surely, in the first place, a process of transcending physical reality, as we just saw, but for Origen both the senses and the intellect are required for someone aiming at knowledge of God. It is no accident that he attributes to the body an important role in the human accomplishment of prayer, though physical reality represents only a preliminary level (with Rom. 1, 20), to be subsequently overcome in the mind's journey towards God.[53] Secondly, these spiritual premises are not sufficient in themselves, without considering their essential presupposition which actually renders man capable of knowing God: this is the "image of God" in him, according to which he has been created;[54] as a consequence of this, Christians look up to God through his Logos, who is indeed the true way to the Father.[55] A third point is advanced by Origen, though it partly converges with the first: he links knowledge of God to the idea of a life which conforms to the spirit and not to the flesh; it is therefore bound to man's continuous fight for virtue and spiritual progress.[56] Fourth, as apologetical reply to Celsus' vindication of an inner sight against the alleged proclivity of the Christians to be captured by the senses, Origen points to the double act of seeing

---

[52] *CC* 7, 44, 39-40: μύσας τοὺς τῆς αἰσθήσεως ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐγείρας τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς, to compare with Celsus' sentence in 7, 36, 7-9: αἰσθήσει μύσαντες ἀναβλέψητε νῷ καὶ σαρκὸς ἀποστραφέντες ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐγείρητε, μόνως οὕτως τὸν θεὸν ὄψεσθε.

[53] *CC* 7, 37. 45. Against Celsus' pleading for a purely intellectual approach, Origen defends the role of the senses in the process leading to the knowledge of God. As for the role of the body in the act of praying see *PE* 31, 2 and *CC* 2, 51; with regard to this passage, M. Fédou observes: "le chrétien en prière n'a pas seulement 'fermé l'entrée des sens' mais 'donné l'éveil aux yeux de l'âme': la faculté des sens spirituels, auxquels Origène consacre de précieux développements, atteste la présence du corps jusque dans le mouvement de l'esprit. Mais c'est celui-ci qui est avant tout souligné et qui, pour le chrétien, définit l'acte de la prière dans son essence même" (*Christianisme et religions païennes* . . ., pp. 361-362).

[54] This well-known aspect of Origen's thought has been thoroughly investigated by H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène* (Paris, 1956).

[55] *CC* 7, 41, 17-18: πρὸς μόνον ἀναβλέποντας διὰ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ λόγου θεόν. Cf. also *CC* 7, 36. 43.

[56] *CC* 7, 37. We may mention again here the theme of the "pure of heart", who alone can see God: cf. 7, 43.

(outwardly and inwardly) as attested to already in the Bible.[57] Finally, man's endeavour to know God has a chance to succeed, only if God himself comes to sustain his efforts, in response to a prayer that recognizes such a necessity—that is, Origen establishes anew what is rather uncorrectly called a "synergistic" model between man and God, inasmuch as in the last instance only the initiative of God is effective.[58]

Taking into account the whole series of elements, we perceive in Origen's impressive description of the act of praying as *anabasis* to God something more than the mere recasting of platonic themes, such as the "inner sight" and the "flight of the soul", although these do leave a considerable imprint on the passage of *CC* 7, 44. As the almost unavoidable result of an apologetic juxtaposition to its philosophical counterpart, Christian prayer here achieves what philosophers, according to Origen, are looking for in vain: the attainment of God and spiritual perfection.[59] By considering "every place" in the world a temple of God (an allusion to 1 Tm. 2, 8), by awakening their inner eyes, led by the tension of their desire to be united with God, Christians not only reach the vault of the heavens, but they surpass it and arrive at the "supercelestial place", where they can contemplate divine reality.[60] Prayer thus performs in the believer a mental journey

---

[57] *CC* 7, 39, 44-49: παντὸς οὖν τοῦ κατὰ τρόπον χριστιανίζοντος ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐγήγερται ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ ὁ τῆς αἰσθήσεως μέμυκε· καὶ ἀνάλογον τῇ ἐγέρσει τοῦ κρείττονος ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ τῇ μύσει τῶν ὄψεων τῆς αἰσθήσεως νοεῖται καὶ θεωρεῖται ἑκάστῳ ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, λόγος καὶ σοφία τυγχάνων.

[58] *CC* 7, 42. The necessity of grace and divine election is asserted again by 7, 44. For a criticism of the assumed "synergism" of Origen, see H. Crouzel, *Origène* (Paris, 1985), p. 171. A more open synergic model appears in Clem. Al., *Strom.* 7, 7, 38, 4 <ἀεὶ> τοίνυν ὁ γνωστικὸς τὴν εὐχὴν καὶ τὴν αἴτησιν τῶν ὄντως ἀγαθῶν τῶν περὶ ψυχὴν ποιεῖται, καὶ εὔχεται συνεργῶν ἅμα καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς ἕξιν ἀγαθότητος ἐλθεῖν (ed. A. Le Boulluec, SC 428: Paris, 1997, p. 138).

[59] Cf. also the parallel passages in *CC* 3, 80 and 5, 2; but especially 7, 51, where Origen emphasizes the knowledge of God continuously granted by the Spirit to the Christians in contrast with its occasional attainment by the wise men of paganism.

[60] *CC* 7, 44, 36-49: Χριστιανὸς δὲ καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης πάντα μὲν τόπον τοῦ κόσμου πέπεισται εἶναι μέρος τοῦ ὅλου, ναοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄντος τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου· «ἐν παντὶ» δὲ «τόπῳ» εὐχόμενος, μύσας τοὺς τῆς αἰσθήσεως ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐγείρας τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς, ὑπεραναβαίνει τὸν ὅλον κόσμον. Καὶ οὐδ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἀψῖδα ἵσταται τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν ὑπερουράνιον γενόμενος τῇ διανοίᾳ τόπον, ὁδηγούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος καὶ ὡσπερεὶ ἔξω τοῦ κόσμου τυγχάνων ἀναπέμπει οὐ περὶ τῶν τυχόντων τὴν εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ· ἔμαθε γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μηδὲν μικρόν, τουτέστιν αἰσθητόν, ζητεῖν ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀληθῶς θεῖα, ὅσα συμβάλλεται διδόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸ ὁδεῦσαι ἐπὶ τὴν παρ' αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου ὄντος θεοῦ μακαριότητα. For A. Méhat, "Le 'lieu supracéleste' de saint Justin

beyond the world, under the guide of the Spirit, while he asks God to receive the "great and heavenly things", as in Jesus' instruction; these moreover are the truly good things which are worthy of God and capable of leading man to beatitude in him, through Christ. As we see from this last explanation, the platonizing picture of prayer is finally completed, if not superseded, by those elements which outline the typically Christian traits of Origen's view of prayer.[61] We find traces here of the "trinitarian" context which accompanies even the most intimate expression of prayer in *PE*, where the act of praying is never held to be merely a moment of self-isolation, just an accomplishment of interiority, but is rather seen as the realization of a larger communion. Such an act of communion not only involves the persons of the Trinity, but implies also the active assistance of the angels and the saints, with the whole "cosmic theatre" as the proper scene of this most personal act.[62] It is true that our passage is silent about these further elements, which confer on Origen's Christian prayer a character quite different from the "spiritual exercises" of the philosophers (despite all the affinities recognisable, for instance, in the practice of inner sight).[63]

à Origène", in *Forma futuri*. Studi in onore del card. M. Pellegrino (Torino, 1975), pp. 282-294 this text "décrit l'ascension de l'âme en termes qui préfigurent la vision d'Augustin à Ostie" (p. 294). He also points to the platonic sources (*Phaedr.* 247 a-c and 248 b), while reminding us that "l'assimilation *topos* = *theos* . . . est banale dans le moyen platonisme et dans la religiosité hellénistique . . ." (p. 283). See also A. Scott, *Origen and the life of the stars* (Oxford, 1991), p. 120.

[61] We may moreover compare Origen's *anabasis* through prayer respectively with Max. Tyr., *Or.* 11, c. 10, 60 ab, and Clem. Al., *Strom.* 7, 13, 82, 5, the spiritual atmosphere of the latter looking quite similar to that of the pagan author. For the definition of prayer as *anabasis*, attested to only later on in Evagrius, though not devoid both of philosophical and biblical premises, see A. Méhat, "Sur deux définitions de la prière", in G. Dorival—A. Le Boulluec (edd.), *Origeniana Sexta* (Leuven, 1995), pp. 115-120.

[62] See *PE* 10, 2; 11, 1; 28, 3. I have recently insisted on this image of prayer in "Origène et la prière: Une lecture du *Peri Euchês*", in *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études. Section des Sciences Religieuses* 106 (1997-1998), pp. 341-345.

[63] For connections with the practice of the "spiritual exercises" in ancient philosophy, see A. Monaci Castagno, "Un invito alla vita perfetta: il ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΧΗΣ di Origene", in F. Cocchini (ed.), *Il dono e la sua ombra* . . ., pp. 116-138. In my opinion, the "treatise" on prayer of Clement of Alexandria in *Strom.* 7 is more liable to be exploited for such analysis, as I would like to show in a future contribution. Analogies and differences can be found also with Plotinus (see P. Hadot, *Plotin ou la simplicité du regard* [Paris, 1997]), but we should recall the question put by H. Crouzel, *Origène et Plotin. Comparaisons doctrinales* (Paris, 1992), p. 112: "Ce dieu est-il quelqu'un qu'on prie? Les mentions de la prière sont rares. Il y a au moins celle-ci: 'Que cela soit dit par nous, ayant invoqué Dieu non à voix haute, mais avec l'âme en nous étendant vers lui dans une prière,

But we have sufficient references to them throughout *CC*, when Origen occasionally provides us with other statements on prayer.

By collecting those together, we can observe that the act of praying is always said to be performed by Christians in relation to the intermediary role of Jesus Christ, the "High-priest" of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (especially Heb. 4, 14-15), who presents our demands to God and bestows on us the benefits granted.[64] This is precisely the way Christians alone are used to praying, as Origen expressly puts it, while replying to Celsus' appeal to practise the cult of demons.[65] The importance of this aspect is better understood, if we consider the constitutive condition of man as a sinner: as such he needs to propitiate God's attitude towards himself through the pleading of an advocate, the incarnate Logos, who being himself man is sensitive to our requests and can ask God the remission of our sins.[66] Instead of being merely a spiritual self-accomplishment, prayer emphasizes for Origen the continuous need of divine help for a frail creature like man. Furthermore, the solitude of the man who prays is broken down also through the assistance and the cooperation that "myriads of angels" assure to him to bring his demands before God.[67] We should notice how this

---

en pouvant le prier ainsi seul à seul' [*Enn.* V, 1 (10), 6, 1. 8]. Mais à quoi correspond chez Plotin la prière?".

[64] *CC* 3, 34, 21-26: (Jesus) ἀνάγοντα ἐπὶ τὴν μετὰ ὀρθοῦ βίου πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν τιμὴν μετ' εὐχῶν, ἃς προσάγομεν αὐτῷ διὰ <τοῦ> ὡς μεταξὺ ὄντος τῆς τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ τῆς τῶν γενητῶν πάντων φύσεως, καὶ φέροντος μὲν ἡμῖν τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς εὐεργεσίας διακομίζοντος δ' ἡμῶν τρόπον ἀρχιερέως τὰς εὐχὰς πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν. See also 7, 46, 7-9 (*supra*, n. 38); and 8, 26, 17-22: μόνῳ γὰρ προσευκτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, καὶ προσευκτέον γε τῷ μονογενεῖ καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ «πάσης κτίσεως» λόγῳ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀξιωτέον αὐτὸν ὡς ἀρχιερέα τὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸν φθάσασαν ἡμῶν εὐχὴν ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ πατέρα τῶν βιούντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ—a passage which seems to associate more directly the Logos to the Father as the addressee of prayer.

[65] *CC* 8, 37, 1-2: ἐπιλαθόμενος ὅτι Χριστιανοῖς λαλεῖ, τοῖς μόνοις τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εὐχομένοις. Apart from the premises set by Origen himself in *PE*, this is already a traditional motif, as we may guess from Clement's ideal of perfection for the gnostic: προσομιλεῖν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως, ἐξομοιούμενον εἰς δύναμιν τῷ κυρίῳ διὰ πάσης τῆς εἰς τὸν θεὸν θεραπείας (*Strom.* 7, 3, 13, 2).

[66] See especially *CC* 8, 13, 18-24: Διὸ τὸν ἕνα θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγον καὶ εἰκόνα ταῖς κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν ἱκεσίαις καὶ ἀξιώσεσι σέβομεν, προσάγοντες τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὰς εὐχὰς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ· ᾧ πρῶτον προσφέρομεν αὐτάς, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτὸν «ἱλασμὸν» ὄντα «τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν» προσαγαγεῖν ὡς ἀρχιερέα τὰς εὐχάς καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις ἡμῶν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ.

[67] For the help of angels with regard to salvation, see *CC* 5, 57-58; 8, 34, 15-16; 8, 36, 21-23; and especially 8, 64, 10-20: συμπράττουσι . . . καὶ συνεύχονται καὶ συναξιοῦσιν·

well-known feature of Origen's theology is meant—with a characteristic note, which was already at work in *PE*—as an additional support for "our perishable race" (τῷ ἐπικήρῳ ἡμῶν γένει).[68] While in a way multiplying the partnership assisting prayer, Origen repeatedly focuses on God as the unique addressee for man: even the stars participate in the praise that just men send to God instead of being themselves an object of petitions.[69]

Though other aspects would support our point,[70] there is no need, I think, to insist on the features which should prove the essential continuity between the image of prayer in *PE* and that met with in *CC*. We cannot of course ignore the diversity of emphasis due to two different contexts. This is found mainly in the fact that the view of the treatise regarding the accomplishment of the union with God in prayer may be termed a "descending" perspective, whereas in *CC* we face an "ascending" one. *PE* shows us the coming down of the Father and the Son with the Spirit in the "little chamber" (Mt. 6, 6) of interiority, into which the "saint" praying withdraws; on the contrary *CC* emphasizes the movement upwards of the soul, adopting the philosophical scheme of the *anabasis*. Yet the factors and the conditions for adequate expression of prayer are still the same even in the apologetic work. What Origen has in mind, is once more the "spiritual prayer", described both in *PE* and in *CC* as the continually renewed exercise of the Christian on his road to perfection, an indispensable means to fulfil it, and at the same time an anticipation (albeit always provisional, because of man's condition) of the fulfilment sought for. Despite the obstacles to be met on the road, Origen is confident of the effectiveness of the "spiritual prayer", both for the individual and for society (inasmuch as con-

---

ὥστε τολμᾶν ἡμᾶς λέγειν ὅτι ἀνθρώποις μετὰ προαιρέσεως προτιθεμένοις τὰ κρείττονα εὐχομένοις τῷ θεῷ μυρίαι ὅσαι ἄκλητοι συνεύχονται δυνάμεις ἱεραί, συμπαρέχουσαι <ἑαυτὰς> τῷ ἐπικήρῳ ἡμῶν γένει καί, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, συναγωνιῶσαι δι' οὓς ὁρῶσιν ἀντιστρατευομένους καὶ ἀνταγωνιζομένους δαίμονας τῇ σωτηρίᾳ μάλιστα τῶν ἑαυτοὺς ἀνατιθέντων θεῷ καὶ μὴ φροντιζόντων τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων ἔχθρας, ἐὰν ἐκεῖνοι ἐξαγριαίνωσι πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

[68] The revealing adjective ἐπίκηρος (*CC* 8, 64, 15), referred respectively to φύσις and to γένος, opens and closes the first section of the treatise (*PE* 1, 1; 17, 2).

[69] *CC* 8, 67, 16-17.

[70] For instance, the idea of a virtuous life as a continuous prayer to God, thus assimilating the life of the saint to an uninterrupted feast. See *CC* 8, 21, 27-30: ἑορτάζει γε κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ὁ «τὰ δέοντα» πράττων, ἀεὶ εὐχόμενος, διὰ παντὸς θύων τὰς ἀναιμάκτους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐχαῖς θυσίας; and n. 71. The same point is developed in *PE* 12, 2 as a fulfilment of 1 Th. 5, 17.

cordant praying is the only "weapon" Christians can dispose of to protect the Roman state from its enemies).[71] The believers who assiduously dedicate themselves to it, through the gift of the Spirit which destroys evil in man, will be able to live the experience of an uninterrupted Pentecost.[72]

Dipartimento di Filologia Classica
Via Galvani, 56100 Pisa Italia

[71] See in *CC* 8, 69 the reply to Celsus' appeal to assume the defence of the empire: a concordant prayer, on the witness of Mt. 19, 19, will be more effective than Moses' crying unto God against Amalek (Ex. 17, 11), of itself a paradigm of the effective prayer to be met with elsewhere in Origen's writings (e.g., in *HomEx.* 3, 3).

[72] *CC* 8, 22, 17-25: ὁ δυνάμενος μετ' ἀληθείας λέγειν· «Συνανέστημεν τῷ Χριστῷ» (Col. 2, 12; 3, 1) ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ· «Συνήγειρε καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ» (Eph. 2, 6) ἀεί ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέραις, καὶ μάλιστα ὅτε καὶ «εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον» ὡς οἱ ἀπόστολοι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀναβὰς σχολάζει τῇ δεήσει καὶ «τῇ προσευχῇ», ὡς ἄξιος γενέσθαι τῆς «φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας» (Act. 1, 13-14; 2, 2-3) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, βιαζομένης ἐξαφανίσαι τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακίαν καὶ τὰ ἀπ' αὐτῆς, ἄξιος δὲ καί τινος μερισμοῦ γλώσσης ἀπὸ θεοῦ πυρίνης.

GENESIS TRADITIONS IN CONFLICT?: THE USE OF SOME EXEGETICAL TRADITIONS IN THE *TRIMORPHIC PROTENNOIA* AND THE JOHANNINE PROLOGUE

BY

NICOLA FRANCES DENZEY

Introduction

Over twenty years ago, in 1978, a renowned panel of scholars of Gnosticism convened at Yale to discuss, among other topics, the literary relationship between a very well known text and a rather obscure one: the prologue from the Gospel of John, and a revelatory discourse from the cache of texts discovered near Nag Hammadi in 1945, the *Trimorphic Protennoia*.[1] The topic had already been broached; as early as 1973, Gesine Schenke and the *Berliner Arbeitskreis für die koptisch-gnostischen Schriften* were the first scholars of Gnosticism on the international scene to note a curious phenomenon: the initially alien *Trimorphic Protennoia*—the sole extant version of an ancient, undated, unascribed Coptic text which Schenke had translated into German for her doctoral dissertation—expanded upon an old mythic pattern, of which the Johannine Prologue formed the most reassuringly familiar example: the threefold salvific descent of God's co-agent into the world to redeem those who were able to recognize their divine origins.[2]

---

[1] The *Trimorphic Protennoia* is the sole extant treatise from the highly damaged NHC Codex XIII, only eight leaves of which survive. For critical editions, see Gesine Schenke, *Die dreigestaltige Protennoia (Nag Hammadi Codex XIII)* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1984); Yvonne Janssens, *La Prôtennoia Trimorphe (NHC XIII,1)* (Laval: Les presses de L'université Laval, 1978) and John Turner, "The Trimorphic Protennoia," *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII*, ed. Charles Hedrick. The Coptic Gnostic Library, NHMS XXVIII (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990). I have used Turner's edition throughout; on occasion, my translation of the Coptic text differs slightly. For some summaries and observations on the difficulties of restoring this fragmented text, see the comments of Robert McL. Wilson, "The Trimorphic Protennoia," *Gnosis and Gnosticism. Papers read at the Seventh Annual International Conference of Patristic Studies, September 8th-13th, 1975*, NHMS VIII (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 50-54.

[2] Another significant text which shares the same set of traditions and patterns as the

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

The question of literary influence and dependency between the two texts spawned almost a dozen academic articles, as scholars argued either for or against Johannine primacy. This debate, like all others, reflected the winds of change within studies of Gnosticism and early Christianity. As the History of Religions approach to religious studies began to dislodge—or at least rattle—more theologically-engaged scholars of early Christianity, the stakes rose behind questions such as whether or not the *Trimorphic Protennoia* had been a gnosticizing "corruption" of a purer Johannine Christianity, whether the Prologue's author betrayed his gnosticizing proclivities by drawing upon earlier gnostic sources, or whether, finally, the intention of the Prologue's author had been to channel speculative gnostic traditions in his day into a new, incarnational theology.[3]

Few academic debates in such a narrow and specialized field as Gnosticism have had the ability to break into the mainstream as this one, engaging as it did one of the most beloved passages of canonical scripture. Suddenly, an obscure non-canonical text *did* matter to other scholars of early Christianity. But then, almost as quickly as it began, interest in the topic waned. The conclusions of the Yale conference generated an aetiology which satisfied most scholars. George MacRae, the chair of the session on Sethian Gnosticism, summarized the conclusions of the participants; rather than sharing any direct textual relationship, the similarities could be explained by recourse to a sort of broad literary contextualization: both texts were

---

Trimorphic Protennoia and the Johannine Prologue is the so-called "Pronoia Hymn" from the long recension of the *Apocryphon of John*. The precise relationship between all three texts remains unclear. The two scholars who have done considerable work on the problem, Roelof van den Broek and Michael Waldstein, concur that the Hymn presents an earlier re-formulation of Wisdom traditions which were then adapted and "masculinized" to fit the motif of a male Redeemer as the Logos. See R. van den Broek, "Von der jüdischen Weisheit zum gnostischen Erlöser: Zum Schlußhymnus des Apokryphons des Johannes," in idem., *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*, NHMS XXXIX (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 86-116; Michael Waldstein, "The Providence Monologue in the Apocryphon of John and the Johannine Prologue," *JECS* 3:4 (1995): 369-402. I have largely neglected discussion of the Pronoia Hymn here not because it is not worthy of further discussion, but because it is beyond the scope of the present study.

[3] See Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) and his *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951 and 1955), esp. 2.3-14; Hans-Martin Schenke, "Die neutestamentliche Christologie und der gnostische Erlöser," in *Gnosis und Neues Testament: Studien aus Religionswissenschaft und Theologie*, ed. Karl-Wolfgang Tröger (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1973), 205-29, esp. 226-7.

likely "dependent on developments of the Wisdom traditions" and may therefore have shared a "common ancestor."[4]

In the past twenty years, almost all the assumptions behind the terms of reference in the 1978 debates between the literary relationships between the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue have been abandoned or significantly altered. The field of Gnosticism has been subjected to extensive scrutiny and revisions, not so much by outsiders, but by specialists in Gnosticism themselves; since the early work of Robert McL. Wilson,[5] and particularly after Michael Williams' provocative book, *Rethinking Gnosticism*, we invoke the descriptive designation "gnostic"—along with that unhelpful academic chimera "Gnosticism"—less and less frequently, and with increasing specificity.[6] Instead, scholars tend to locate early Christian heterodox thought within intellectual continuities of the ancient world, particularly within Hellenistic Jewish philosophy and exegesis.

This paper offers a new approach to an old debate regarding the relationship between the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Johannine Prologue. I would like to bring to the topic four points. First, we can discuss the similarities between these texts without having to invoke either text's ostensible relationship to "Gnosticism." Second, I propose we abandon the alternate paradigm, first articulated by MacRae and others in 1978, that these similarities can be "explained" as a mutual dependency on a shared body of Wisdom traditions. Third, following the trend in recent scholarship to uncover hermeneutical patterns of Jewish scriptural exegesis in early Christian heterodox literature, I suggest that the *Trimorphic Protennoia*—like the Johannine Prologue—is best understood not as a "Gnosticizing, hermeneutical" elaboration on Wisdom traditions but as a soteriological myth based upon a specific, traditional way of reading and interpreting Genesis 1. Consequently, we must delve more deeply into the relationship between

---

[4] George MacRae, "Gnosticism and the Church of John's Gospel," in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, eds. Charles Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986), 91.

[5] R. McL. Wilson, "Slippery Words: II. Gnosis, Gnostic, Gnosticism," *Expository Times* 89 (1977-78): 296-301. See also Wilfrid Cantwell Smith, "Terminological Boobytraps," in *Traditions in Contact and Change: Selected Proceedings of the XIVth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions*, eds. Peter Slater *et al.* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1983), 306, on the "verbal inanities" of discussing as "gnosticism" a movement composed of people who never called themselves "gnostics."

[6] Michael Williams, *Rethinking Gnosticism: Arguments for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

the two texts, searching out differences behind their apparent samenesses. While the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue display similar exegetical traditions and strategies, they employ them to very different ends. Beyond the "parallels" which scholars have noted in our two texts, the texts themselves use the same vocabulary drawn from Genesis to argue different and often contrary points about the nature of the divine and about human spiritual possibilities.

The Trimorphic Protennoia and the Johannine Prologue: A Brief History of the Debate

In 1973, members of the *Berliner Arbeitskreis* explained the relationship between the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Johannine Prologue initially as a "gnosticizing" of Johannine traditions; the *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s emphasis on salvation through *gnosis*, as well as its scaffolding of elaborate speculative cosmologies, were proof that the *Trimorphic Protennoia* could be securely located within the so-called "gnostic" literature of the second-century—well after the Johannine Prologue had been composed. Within a year, the *Berliner Arbeitskreis* reversed positions, finding the theme of the threefold descent of the Logos as more "naturally" at home within the context of the *Trimorphic Protennoia* than within the polemical traditions of John.[7] Since the *Berliner Arbeitskreis*' influential work, most scholars have fallen into one of two camps: some maintain that the Prologue depends on the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, while others view the *Trimorphic Protennoia* as dependent upon the Prologue or one of its earlier sources. Gesine Robinson (formerly Schenke) led the charge among scholars who adopted the hypothesis of *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s precedence;[8] the group grew to include Carsten Colpe,[9] Craig A. Evans,[10]

---

[7] For a review of the issue, see G. Schenke, "Der dreigestaltige Protennoia: Eine gnostische Offenbarungsrede in koptischer Sprache aus dem Fund von Nag Hammadi eingeleitet und übersetzt vom Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostischen Schriften," *ThLZ* 99 (1974): 733. Robinson reiterates her point in "The Trimorphic Protennoia," 45: "For even if Trimorphic Protennoia, in the form in which we have it, is no doubt younger than the Fourth Gospel, it nonetheless provides the natural context for the Fourth Gospel's Prologue."

[8] G. Schenke, "Die dreigestaltige Protennoia," 731-46.

[9] Carsten Colpe, "Heidnische, jüdische und christliche Überlieferung in den Schriften aus Nag Hammadi III, *JAC* 17 (1974): 107-25.

[10] Craig A. Evans, "On the Prologue of John and the Trimorphic Protennoia," *NTS* 27 (1981): 395-401.

James Robinson,[11] and John Turner.[12] Those who favored Johannine precedence included Yvonne Janssens[13] (who, like Gesine Robinson, later modified her position to suggest that the texts shared a background in Jewish Wisdom literature),[14] Robert McL. Wilson,[15] George MacRae,[16] Edwin Yamauchi,[17] Michel Tardieu,[18] and most recently, Alastair Logan.[19]

Although the initial discovery of the parallels between the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Johannine Prologue produced a flurry of excitement in academic circles, discussion quickly "degenerated," in Gesine Robinson's words, into "a debate about the dependence of one text on the other."[20] To illustrate the significant and numerous points of contact, many scholars, including Carsten Colpe,[21] Yvonne Janssens,[22] and Craig Evans bolstered their articles with lists of the parallels between the two texts. As a fairly paradigmatic example of the scholarship from the late 1970s I reproduce Evans' table of parallels below:[23]

---

[11] James M. Robinson, "Sethians and Johannine Thought: The Trimorphic Protennoia and the Prologue of the Gospel of John," in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the Conference at Yale, March 1978.* Volume II, *Sethian Gnosticism*, ed. Bentley Layton (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 643-61.

[12] John Turner, "The *Trimorphic Protennoia*: Introduction," 385-6.

[13] Yvonne Janssens, "Une source gnostique du prologue?" in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Theologie*, ed. Marinus du Jonge (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1977), 355-8.

[14] Yvonne Janssens, "The Trimorphic Protennoia and the Fourth Gospel," in *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honor of Robert McL. Wilson*, eds. Alastair Logan and Alexander J. Wedderburn (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983), 229-245, esp. 235.

[15] Robert McL. Wilson, "The Trimorphic Protennoia," in *Gnosis and Gnosticism.* NHMS VIII (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 50-54.

[16] George MacRae, "Gnosticism and the Church of St. John's Gospel," 89-96.

[17] Edwin Yamauchi, "Jewish Gnosticism? The Prologue of John, Mandean Parallels, and the *Trimorphic Protennoia*," in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, eds. Roelof van den Broek and Maarten J. Vermaseren. EPRO 91 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 467-97.

[18] Michel Tardieu, *Écrits Gnostiques: Codex de Berlin* (Sources Gnostiques et Manicheeans 1) (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1984).

[19] Alastair Logan, "John and the Gnostics: The Significance of the *Apocryphon of John* for the Debate about the Origins of the Johannine Literature," *JSNT* 43 (1991): 41-69, esp. 58-59.

[20] G. Robinson, "The *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel," in *Gnosticism and the Early Christian World: In Honor of James Robinson*, eds. James E. Goehring, Charles W. Hedrick, Jack T. Sanders, and Hans Dieter Betz (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1990), 38.

[21] Carsten Colpe, "Heidnische Überlieferung," 122.

[22] Yvonne Janssens, "Une source gnostique du prologue?" 355-8.

[23] Craig A. Evans, "Prologue of John," 397. Evans culls his parallels to the Prologue

Johannine Prologue		Trimorphic Protennoia
v. 1	beginning	46:10 beginning
	word	46:5, 14, 16,30; 47:15 word
	with God	46:20-21 offspring of God
v. 2	beginning	46:10 beginning
	with God	46:20-21 offspring of God
v. 3	through him all things came to be	46:24-25 the source of the All, the root the entire aeon; It is the foundation; 47:10 I became a foundation for the All
v. 4	life	46:17 life; 46:17 living water [= life]; 46:28 It is the breath of the powers
	light	46:11, 16, 24 light
v. 5	light	46:11, 16, 24 light
	darkness	46:32 darkness
v. 9	light	46:11, 16, 24 light
	illuminates every person	46:32 illumine those who dwell in darkness
	coming into the world	46:31 sent
v. 10	know	46:35; 47:19 know
v. 11	he came into his own	46:31 it was sent
	his own did not receive him	47:18-19 they did not know the one who empowers me
v. 12	as many as received him, to them he gave authority to be children of God	47:12-13 I gave shape to those who took shape until their consummation; 47:10-11 I empowered them
v. 14	word became flesh dwelt among us	47:15-16 as the Word I revealed myself in the likeness of their shape. And I wore everyone's garment and hid myself within them
	glory	46:19, 27 glory
v. 16	fullness	46:11-30 [fullness = the list of attributes]; 47:19-20 For I dwell within all the Sovereignties and Powers
	we all received	46:33-35 I will reveal to you my mysteries since you are my fellow brethren (cp. 47:14-17, 23)
v. 18	that one revealed him	46:33-35 I will reveal to you my mysteries since you are my fellow brethren (cp. 47:14-17, 23)
		46:29 voice; 46:31-32 it was sent to illumine

---

from just over two pages of text in the *Trimorphic Protennoia*—passages all taken from Protennoia's summary of her descents toward the end of the tractate.

Tables such as these, however, can lead to misleading conclusions. Evans confines himself to certain keywords (what he erroneously calls "conceptual parallels") shared by the two texts. These can indicate some manner of shared literary milieu; they do not prove us textual dependency or context. Evans himself is forced to admit, "certainly both Protennoia and the Prologue are drawing upon a similar religious milieu . . . but the question of the direction of possible literary dependence is not as apparent."[24] He gives no indication of what this "similar religious milieu" might be, nor does he push his parallels far enough to properly locate them within this context. Similarly, Janssens considers carefully in one article the ostensible parallels before observing, "while identical terms occur in *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Fourth Gospel, they do not have the same meaning."[25] Unfortunately, she neither explains nor pursues this provocative insight. Quoting James Robinson, ("there are parallels in thought which may indicate only a common background") she concludes, "With this I wholeheartedly agree. But at present I leave the last word to specialists in the Fourth Gospel."[26]

The Trimorphic Protennoia, the Johannine Prologue, and Wisdom Traditions

Janssens' "failure of nerve" to claim the last word on the debate reflects the enthusiasm with which scholars embraced the conclusion reached at the Yale conference. It effectively broke the academic stalemate which the issue of textual dependency had created. It even allowed Gesine Robinson, Yvonne Janssens and John Turner—the three scholars responsible for critical translations of the *Trimorphic Protennoia* into modern languages—to concur that the oldest components of the text reflect an early stage of speculation on the nature of Protennoia as Wisdom, based upon Hellenized Jewish traditions which depicted Wisdom as God's co-agent at creation.[27] The Pronoia Hymn of the *Apocryphon of John* appears to work similarly with these same traditions. The Prologue of John represents a relatively late *floruit* of these same traditions, with Christ/Logos taking the place once

---

[24] Evans, "Prologue of John," 398.

[25] Janssens, "The Trimorphic Protennoia," 242.

[26] Janssens, "The Trimorphic Protennoia," 243.

[27] See, for instance, G. Schenke, *Dreigestaltige Protennoia*, 89 who defines Protennoia as "a modified form of the Jewish Sophia." See also Turner, "*Trimorphic Protennoia*: Introduction," 375. For the Wisdom passages, see Proverbs 8; Sirach 23; *Wisdom of Solomon* 6-10; and 1 Enoch 42.

assigned to Wisdom.[28] With its characterization of Wisdom as God's co-agent in creation, Proverbs 8 (particularly 8:22) provides an analogue to both Protennoia and the Logos: "The Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old."[29] Because Wisdom traditions already placed Wisdom alongside God at the creation, many ancient exegetes would have assumed that God had addressed Wisdom at Gen 1:26; Wisdom traditions also clearly account for Protennoia as a breath, spirit or emanation of God (Wis 7:25; 9:17), as Adam's redeemer (Wis 10:1), and as Life (Pvb 8:35).

Yet Jarl Fossum poses a vexing question: if Wisdom provides the model for the revealer in the Johannine Prologue, why is the latter called λόγος and not simply σοφία? The question is even more troubling for the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, which despite its divine feminine revealer, never directly identifies Protennoia as Sophia. Scholars have solved the problem of the lack of an explicit Wisdom theology in both the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue by narrowing the conceptual gap between the Word and Wisdom in Hellenistic thought. Recently, the issue has been addressed by Jack T. Sanders.[30] The *Odes of Solomon*, Sanders notes, contain a well-developed theology of the Word (*ptgm'* or *bmlt'*) of God, in which the Word accompanies God at creation and indwells all humankind.[31] Philo, too, frequently equates a hypostasized Wisdom with Logos.[32] Both the Logos and Wisdom

---

[28] The groundbreaking work of Rudolf Bultmann first alerted the academic community to the Prologue's dependence on Wisdom imagery. See R. Bultmann, "Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-Evangelium," in *Eucharisterion. Festschrift für Hermann Gunkel*, ed. H. Schmidt. FRLANT 37; (2 vols., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923). Bultmann followed a hypothesis already proposed by J. Rendel Harris, *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917); C. H. Dodd further bolstered Bultmann's ideas, detecting numerous parallels between sapiential literature and the Prologue, in his *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

[29] See also Wis 6:23; *TriPro* 35:4-6, 30, 34; 46:10; Jn 1:1-3.

[30] Jack T. Sanders, "Nag Hammadi, Odes of Solomon, and New Testament Christological Hymns," in *Gnosticism and the Early Christian World: In Honor of James Robinson*, eds. James E. Goehring *et al.*, 51-66.

[31] Sanders, 57.

[32] In Philo's writing, Sharon Lea Mattila notes, "Wisdom enjoys a supracosmological status, affirmed above all by her close affiliation and frequent identity with the figure of the logos," in her article "Wisdom, Sense Perception, Nature, and Philo's Gender Gradient," *HTR* 89:2 (1996): 109. See also E. R. Goodenough, "Philo flatly identifies the Logos with Sophia," in *By Light, Light* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1935), 23. Harry A. Wolfson concurs in his *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism*,

create (δημιουργέω) the cosmos;[33] both are termed the "chiefest" or "eldest" (πρεσβύτατος/πρεσβυτέρα) present at creation,[34] and even the creation or "the beginning" (ἀρχή) itself.[35] In language reminiscent of the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, Logos and Wisdom reflect for Philo "the image of God" (εἰκὼν θεοῦ).[36] The Logos is the model (παράδειγμα) of the primordial light,[37] just as Wisdom is God's archetypal (ἀρχέτυπος) luminary.[38] Wisdom is also the spring or source (πηγή) from which the divine Logos flows; elsewhere, however, Philo reverses the roles: the "supreme Divine Logos" is the source (πηγή) from which Wisdom springs.[39] The apparent ancient confluence of ideas concerning the Logos and Wisdom allowed C. H. Dodd to define the Logos confidently as "a concept closely similar to that of Wisdom, that is to say, the hypostasized thought of God projected in creation, and remaining as an immanent power within the world and in man."[40]

For the authors of the Prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, however, Christ and Protennoia were not mere types or incarnations of Wisdom; they were Wisdom's fulfillment, or better, her replacement, in the form of the Logos. It may be misleading, therefore, to state that both texts draw upon Wisdom traditions; more correctly, sapiential literature shares with our two texts certain paradigms for understanding the nature of agency in Genesis' creation account. To state the issue even more succinctly, the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and Johannine Prologue remain as representative examples not of a Wisdom tradition, but rather of a distinct "Word tradition" which shared sapiental literature's dependency on Genesis yet interpreted it rather differently. This tradition attributed a creative force not to God's hypostasized forethought or Wisdom, but to his Voice or Word.

Recently, Jarl Fossum has persuasively argued that in place of a Wisdom tradition, a Word tradition stands behind the Johannine Prologue, in which

---

Christianity and Islam. 2 vols; (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947), I. 258, as does Burton Mack, *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im hellenistischen Judentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 110, n. 10.

[33] Philo, *Spec. leg.* 1.81.

[34] Philo, *Fug.* 101; *Rer. Div. Her.* 205; *Virt.* 62.

[35] Philo, *Conf. Ling.* 146.

[36] Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.43.

[37] Philo, *Som.* 1.75.

[38] Philo, *Mig. Abr.* 40.

[39] Philo, *Som.* 2.242; *Fug.* 108-9; Mattila, 110. Compare *Trimorphic Protennoia* 46:16-20. For Biblical precedents, see Prov 13:14; 14:27; 18:4.

[40] C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, 295.

Jewish exegetes interpreted God's act of creation through a word of command in Gen 1:3 with the invocation of his secret Name, the Tetragrammaton.[41] Fossum produces as evidence numerous texts which express a powerful and pervasive Logos theology within Jewish exegeses of Genesis 1, the earliest of which may be Psalm 33:6: "By the word of the Lord the heavens were made; and all their host by the breath of his mouth," and which is echoed, among other sources, in the *Odes of Solomon*: "There is nothing outside of the Lord, because He was before anything came to be. And the worlds are by his Word, and by the thoughts of his heart."[42] Although Fossum does not address the *Trimorphic Protennoia* in his article, it appears to draw upon this same tradition. Protennoia as Logos bears both the divine Name and his Breath.[43] The most intriguing evidence that the *Trimorphic Protennoia* draws upon this Word tradition remains its distinctive theology of sound; Protennoia descends in three distinct manifestations, as Sound, Voice and Word.

The Wisdom tradition hypothesis provides little help if we try to delve into the source for Protennoia's descents as three forms of progressively articulated sound. If we look for the theme of divine theophony within the two other texts bearing a similarity to the *Trimorphic Protennoia*—namely the Johannine Prologue and the Pronoia Hymn—we find that sound heralds the epiphany of the Savior figure only in the first treatise. It appears, therefore, that the *Trimorphic Protennoia* either develops Wisdom traditions rather differently than its "sister" texts to create an elaborate theology of sound, or it draws upon a different tradition which has already developed the model for a theophonic manifestation of God, or for sound's ability to alter cosmic structure. The Wisdom hypothesis, in short, leaves us without the crucial key to understand the ground of the *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s unique

---

[41] Jarl Fossum, "In the Beginning was the Name: Onomanology as the Key to Johannine Christology," in *The Image of the Invisible God: The Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 117-133.

[42] *Odes of Solomon*, 18:6. See also Ps 33:9; 104:5-7. The *Odes of Solomon* appear to reflect the same Word tradition over and against a Wisdom tradition; Jack Sanders ("Nag Hammadi, Odes of Solomon," 60) notes that the word "Wisdom" appears only four times throughout the entire collection of the Odes, although references to the Word are extensive.

[43] See *Trimorphic Protennoia* 35:6, in which Protennoia is "called by three names (ⲛⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲛⲣⲁⲛ)," which are, apparently, linked to her progressive revelation as Sound, Voice and Word. In 37:7, the Logos has within him the Name which has the power to reveal "the everlasting things." For Protennoia as the divine Breath or Voice, see 35:32 and 45:27-28.

theology of sound, although it appears more helpful for the Pronoia Hymn and the Johannine Prologue.

The Wisdom hypothesis presents a second significant interpretive problem: the motif of threefold descent. Scholars widely agree that the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, Johannine Prologue, and Pronoia hymn all appear to share the same motif of a threefold descent of a savior. John Turner, who has undertaken arguably the most comprehensive analysis of "gnostic" threefold descent, has explained the shared use of this motif as the consequences of a "common membership in a religious world prone to conceiving the advent of the divine into the world in terms of a descending-ascending redeeming wisdom figure."[44] Turner's assessment, while helpful, remains vague; certainly all religious texts from the ancient world share this type of "common membership," yet not all adopt the motif of the threefold descent of a Wisdom or Word figure.

According to Roelof van den Broek, the three-step rhythm of the descent of Pronoia in the Pronoia Hymn likely derives from 1 Enoch 42, in which Wisdom descends from the heavenly realm but finds no place to dwell.[45] It is difficult, however, to draw out three specific descents from the Enoch passage—an exegetical problem for modern textual critics as well, as they consistently try to draw out a threefold, sequential, chronological descent within our texts. As we shall see, the conviction that all these texts reflect three chronological, successive descents of Wisdom is not actually borne out within the texts themselves. *Trimorphic Protennoia*, in particular, seems to posit one single descent of Pronoia in three progressively articulated manifestations of sound. Can we find a more convincing source for this type of descent than that which sapiential traditions offer? The answer, I believe, is yes.

Genesis Traditions in the Trimorphic Protennoia and the Johannine Prologue

Is it possible to find a satisfying "source" for both the Johannine Prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia*—a single source which contains all the disparate and scattered elements of both Wisdom and Word traditions, or which prepares the ground for their later development? Fossum's study of Word traditions offers our first clue: behind ancient debates on the nature and agency of the Logos and Sophia stands the formidable authority of

---

[44] Turner, "*Trimorphic Protennoia*: Introduction," 375.

[45] R. van den Broek, "Von der jüdischen Weisheit," 92.

the Book of Genesis. Both these texts draw heavily upon Genesis 1, particularly God's two injunctions in Gen 1:3 and 1:26-27. All the concepts that the Prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia* share—a joint creation, primordial light, the ordering of chaos, the Voice/Word of God—are already present in Genesis.

Remarkably, scholars have consistently failed to consider Genesis' impact on the *Trimorphic Protennoia.* Yvonne Janssens never suggests Genesis as a source in her critical edition, while Schenke, almost in passing, mentions briefly the connection between the prominent concept of the "image" of the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and Genesis 1.[46] The echoes of Genesis may have been too obvious for scholars such as Janssens and Schenke to have considered worth mentioning. At the same time, the ubiquity of Genesis exegetical traditions within extant ancient religious tractates underscores Genesis' central importance. Hellenistic exegetes generated from this sacred text varied hermeneutical strategies, some of which resulted in both Word and Wisdom traditions. Interest in these secondary, exegetical traditions has distracted us from examining the manner in which these traditions drew upon their source; the answer to the mystery of textual relationship between the Prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia* has been sitting right before us.

To highlight the manner in which both the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue invoke Genesis traditions, I compare the three texts below:

Genesis	*Trimorphic Protennoia*	Johannine Prologue
v. 1 In the beginning (ἀρχή), God created the heaven and the earth,	35:5: Protennoia is "she who exists before the All" (scholarly reconstruction) (cf. 35:30) 35:33-34: "I exist from the first" (scholarly reconstruction)	v. 1 In the beginning (ἀρχή) was the Word,
v. 2 and the earth was invisible (ἀόρατος) and unprepared,	35:7, 24: "I am invisible (ⲁⲧⲛⲁϩ) . . ."[47]	

[46] G. Schenke, *Die Dreigestaltige Protennoia,* 122.

[47] Protennoia is characterized in the aretalogies by a large number of apophatic adjectives likely drawn from Middle Platonist language of the divine, including "incomprehensible" (35:10; 36:2, 21), "numberless" (35:27), "immeasurable" (35:28; 36:3; 46:15, 18, 24), "invisible" (35:7, 24; 36:27; 46:18), "ineffable" (35:28; 46:5, 14), "undefiled"

and darkness (σκότος) was over the face of the Abyss (ἄβυσσος)	37:14-15: the Word reveals itself to "those who dwell in the darkness (ⲠⲔⲀⲔⲈ)" and "those who dwell in the Abyss (ⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦ)" 40:22: the inhabitants of the Abyss tremble at the coming of Protennoia/Light	
and the spirit (πνεῦμα) of God breathed out (or moved) (ἐπεφέρετο) over the waters.	38:11: Protennoia is "the image of the Invisible Spirit (πνεῦμα)."[48] 35:2: "I am the movement (ⲠⲔⲒⲘ) that dwells in the All" 35:12: "I move in every creature" (cf. Gen 1:27, where God breathes his spirit or breath into Adam)	
v. 3 and God said,	35:32: "I am a Voice (ⲢⲢⲞⲞⲨⲦ)" 36:14: "I am the real Voice" 36:17-18: "I am the Thought of the Father and through me proceeded the Voice" 46:30-32: "It is Word (λόγος) by virtue of Speech; it was sent to illumine those who dwell in the darkness"	v. 1 In the beginning was the Word (λόγος), and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
"let there be light! (Γενηθήτω φῶς)" And there was light (φῶς).	36:4-5: "I descended to Amente and I shone down upon the darkness"	v. 5 "the light shines in the darkness."

(46:6, 15, 18), "inconceivable" (46:15) and "unreproducible" (46:19, 23). Although likely unrelated to Gen 1:2, Janssens notes ("The Trimorphic Protennoia," 237) that apophatic adjectives are not used to characterize the divine in the Johannine Prologue.

[48] Compare Col 1:15-16, "[he] is the image of the invisible God, for in him were created all things."

	45:7: Protennoia produces the light (ⲡⲟⲧⲉⲓⲛ)
	46:11-13: "There is a light that dwells hidden in Silence and it was first to come forth."
	48:29: "I am the light which illumines the All" "I am the light which rejoices in my brethren"
v. 26 and God said, "Let us make a human (ἄνθρωπος), according to our image (εἰκών) and our likeness (ὁμοίωσις)."	38:11: Protennoia as "the image (εἰκών) of the Invisible Spirit"
	40:32-34: "I am hidden within them, empowering them and giving them shape (εἰκών)".
	45:23-24: "For it is I who
2:7: And God modelled the human being from the earth and breathed (ἐνεφύσησεν) into its face a breath of life (πνοὴν ζωῆς), and the human became a living spirit (εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν).	gave shape (εἰκών) to the All when it had no form (μορφή). (cf. 47:12)
	45:28: "It is I who put the breath within my own. And I cast into them the eternally holy Spirit (πνεῦμα)."

We learn at least two things from this table. First, both the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue closely follow the sequence of events in Genesis' creation account, although they choose to focus and expand upon a different series of moments within sacred history; this alone makes Genesis a more convincing source for the texts than the disparate Wisdom accounts which scholars have cobbled together in an attempt to provide for them a cohesive structural framework. Second, there is little replication of the LXX's precise wording, even given the *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s translation from its original Greek into Coptic. Instead, both authors seize upon certain key terms, upon which they then freely elaborate.

A table of parallels, however, provides only a very preliminary case for

the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue's dependency on Genesis. The cluster of shared words or concepts evident from this table—including a marked interest in the beginning, the creative activities of God the Father, and the primordial Light and Water—furnish only the initial, most primitive indication that the conceptual world of Genesis informed our texts. It cannot do justice to the sophisticated conceptual elaborations on Genesis we find in both. Their authors sought not merely to parrot Genesis' technical terminology, but rather to fill out Genesis' ambiguities by drawing upon a wide range of complex philosophical ideas. The table of terminological parallels obscures or prohibits us from recognizing a crucial point: these texts were designed as "gap-fillers." To regard Genesis as full of troubling gaps formed part of the intellectual legacy of Hellenized Judaism; the Jews who composed the earliest strata of the Johannine Prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, fluent in the concepts and vocabulary of Greek philosophy, meditated on Genesis 1-3. They composed their texts for other intellectuals such as themselves who sought dynamic, creative, and above all, satisfactory information on the nature of origins and divine activity absent from Genesis.

What happens if we move beyond a search for terminological parallels, and seek, as did the author of the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, to fill out Genesis' protological "gaps"? Genesis 1:1, we recall, opens with God's creation of the heavens and the earth, at which point is the earth "invisible" (ἀόρατος) and "unformed" (ἀκατασκεύαστος). A third territory, the Abyss, remains blanketed in darkness. The Spirit (πνεῦμα) of God then breathes down over the waters, accompanied by God's voice calling out "Let there be light [Γενηθήτω φῶς]." By the second century BCE, many Hellenistic Jewish exegetes had already "explained" that properly understood, this Spirit of God was none other than Wisdom acting as God's co-agent. Other exegetes, as we have seen, interpreted God's voice or Word as a creative force. The *Trimorphic Protennoia* appears to combine both traditions; before God articulated his injunction "let there be light," its author understood that this statement must first have existed as a thought which, in a sense, "accompanied" God at creation. Since the act of speaking articulates and actualizes thought, God's "first thought" becomes hypostasized as Protennoia, the "Thought of the Invisible One (42:6)," who is also called Epinoia ("externalized thought").

In the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, Protennoia exists from the beginning as Thought, but descends into the lower cosmos in three progressive manifestations—as Sound, Voice and finally as Word, all of which pierce the surrounding darkness and silence to enter into every order of soul (ψυχή)

(35:1-36:27). Here again, the author spins an elaborate interpretation of Genesis 1. Protennoia is the movement (35:2) of the invisible spirit of Genesis 1:2 as God's breath or spirit. She is also the Light (φῶς) (37:8),[49] which shines into the "Abyss" (37:14), embodying both the substance and agency of the Voice of the Father which "shines down" (36:5) into the darkness, with God's words in Genesis 1:3, "Let there be light." Most significantly, she is all manifestations of the words themselves, as the Sound of the Father's thoughts, his Voice, and his actualizing Word.

If the *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s connection between Light as substance and articulated Sound as its medium seems attenuated and abstract, other texts roughly contemporary with the *Trimorphic Protennoia* reveal that the connection was made frequently. The cosmology of the first Hermetic tractate, the *Poimandres*, for example, draws upon similar exegetical traditions of Genesis 1-3, linking together the primordial Light with articulated Sound to produce the *hagios logos*.[50] In the second tractate of the *Untitled Bruce* Codex, the First Father gives form to the All within himself; he is the Deep and the Great Abyss.[51] The Father is ineffable and incomprehensible, but his "Voice has penetrated everywhere. This is the first sound until the All perceived and understood."[52] To offer a final example, the fragmentary *Thought of Norea* from Nag Hammadi contains a prayer in which emerges the same cluster of associations between the Father, the Light, and the Father's Voice: "Father of All, Ennoia of the Light . . . Voice of Truth, upright Nous, untouchable Logos and ineffable Voice, incomprehensible Father!"[53] These authors drew upon Genesis 1:1-3, emphasizing—as does the *Trimorphic Protennoia*—the imminence of the Voice of the Father within all creation.[54]

---

[49] In fact, the *Trimorphic Protennoia* identifies Protennoia as either the embodiment or the source of the light three times, at 47:28, 29 and 30.

[50] *Corpus Hermeticum* 1 (*Poimandres*) 1:1-5 (Nock/Festugière 1.6-8).

[51] *Untitled Bruce* 1:6-17 (V. McDermott, 226)

[52] *Untitled Bruce* 1:6-17 (V. McDermott, 226)

[53] *Thought of Norea*, NHC IX 27,11-20 (Giversen/Pearson, 446).

[54] The Pronoia Hymn shares with the *Trimorphic Protennoia* the identification of its savior with Light; Pronoia is "the richness of the light," and "the light which exists in the light." She comes from the realm of Light and illumines the Darkness, in dualistic language very similar to the Johannine Prologue. Nowhere, however, does the Hymn associate Light imagery with sound imagery. Pronoia's manifestation as sound, in fact, is completely absent from the text (odd, for a so-called "hymn"!). One wonders if this suggests that the Pronoia Hymn may have relied upon Wisdom traditions more resolutely than the Word tradition which appears to have inspired the *Trimorphic Protennoia*. On

How can we be sure that the Prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia* are both exegeting Genesis, and not merely drawing on each other? The nature of shared terminology suggests a more complex textual relationship between the two texts than scholars have initially admitted. Evans notes, "Virtually all of the vocabulary items of the Prologue are to be found in Protennoia, but the reverse cannot be said."[55] In fact, in terms of direct literary or textual dependence, there are many significant, characteristic Johannine terms entirely absent from *Trimorphic Protennoia*: nouns such as "God," "human," "blood," "flesh," expressions such as "children of God," and verbs such as "to believe," "to come," "to receive," and "to testify or bear witness." All these terms express diverse aspects of the Prologue's incarnation theology—central to Johannine Christianity, but nowhere to be found in the *Trimorphic Protennoia*. This disjunction in key terminology underscores the fact that we are not dealing with parallel texts, or even three texts with a direct literary connection or source, but with treatises which share commonplace, protologically-oriented vocabulary such as "word," "light," "truth," "beginning," and "cosmos," but employ these words to express radically different soteriologies.

Genesis Traditions in Conflict?

Yvonne Janssens, in her investigation of literary relationship between the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Johannine Prologue, noted: "It is easy enough to establish a parallel between the first five verses of the prologue of John and those of Genesis." She continues, "If the same terms are found in Codex XIII, they are not there in the same order and the meaning is, by the way, not at all the same.[56] Janssens does not elaborate on the way in which our two texts adopt the same terms from Genesis to derive from them very different meaning, but she suggests for us an approach. If we start from the uncomfortable disjunctures between the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue—or more accurately, if we pay close attention to the precise manner in which these two texts use similar language—it soon becomes clear that what appears at the surface as a striking parallel is

---

the Hymn's reliance upon Jewish sapientialism, see van den Broek, "Von der jüdischen Weisheit," *passim*; it seems however, that Wisdom traditions do not adequately explain the repeated and insisted emphasis upon Pronoia as Light, nor the characteristic three-step descent of Pronoia.

[55] Evans, "Prologue of John," 398.

[56] Yvonne Janssens, "Une source gnostique . . ." 355.

actually the locus of a profound debate or disagreement on the content and significance of shared religious terminology. An examination of texts and contexts side by side offer numerous occasions for commentary, but let me confine myself here to a few examples.

First, the prevailing religious perspective of the two texts reveals a tension between what we might term the *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s philosophy of universalism and the Prologue's philosophy of particularism. In the Prologue, Jesus is, metaphorically, the light which "illuminates every person . . . coming into the world." The motif is distinctively Johannine—it is a feature not only of the Prologue, but of the entire Gospel as well as the Johannine epistles.[57] Properly understood, however, the light does not shine within everyone; Christ is the sole embodiment of the light—a point the gospel emphasizes.[58]

The message presented in the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, however, is markedly different. Protennoia, too, is the light; she likewise pours her light out into the cosmos. But this light is not a beacon to guide people into right belief. Rather, Protennoia's light actually penetrates all beings. The aretalogies repeatedly emphasize the indwelling nature of Protennoia in various manifestations, not merely as light, but also as life, seed, and voice. She permeates all levels of beings, and all classes of beings, including "material souls" (ὑλικὴ ψυχή) (35:12-18).[59] The *Trimorphic Protennoia* appears here to be tapping into an exegetical perspective of Gen 1:3 in which the primordial light suddenly, at God's command, pours out into every element of the cosmos. A similar point is made in the Pronoia hymn, where Pronoia embodies the light, proceeds from the Light realm, and fills her face with the "light of the completion (συντέλεια) of their aeon" on her third descent to Hades.[60] Indeed, as a theme, it is remarkably pervasive in ancient literature. We find this theme echoed, for example, in the *Gospel of Eve's*

---

[57] See 1:4, 5, 7, 8, 9; 3:19, 20, 21. 5:35; 8:12; 9:5; 12:36, 46.

[58] See, for example, John 1:8 on John the Baptist: "This one was not the light, but came to bear witness to the light," and 12:46.

[59] See also 35:19-20; 36:15-16.

[60] ApJn 31:1. The word ⲡⲟⲧⲉⲓⲛ is used at least seven times in the Pronoia Hymn. See 30:15, "I am the richness of the light," 30:23 "I came forth from those who belong to the light," 30:35: "I am the light which exists in the light," and 31:11: "I am the Pronoia of the pure Light." R. van der Broek ("Von der jüdischen Weisheit," 99) concurs that Pronoia's most significant manifestation is as a "Lichtgestalt," which he suggests connects her to the Pleroma.

"Wherever you are, it is I who am there; I am sown in all things"[61] as well as in the discourse of the Light in the *Gospel of Thomas*'s Logion 77,

> It is I who am the light which is above them all
> It is I who am the All
> From me did the All come forth, and unto Me did the All extend.
> Split a piece of wood and I am there.
> Lift up a stone and you will find me there.

The prevalence of the theme of the universality of the divine light-image suggests that the *Trimorphic Protennoia* follows an established exegetical tradition based on Genesis 1:3's "let there be light," which stands in direct contrast to the Prologue's claim that the "true Light" is sent to guide followers toward "believing into" the Logos. Salvation, within this tradition, takes place not when an individual yields his or her belief over to a redeemer, but when he or she recognizes the portions of the divine light within.

Second, the mythological scenario into which the light enters the cosmos differs in the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue. Elaine Pagels has recently explored what she terms one of three "negations" in the Prologue's theology: revelation occurs within an adversarial cosmos.[62] The light exists in a hostile darkness which fails to comprehend or overwhelm it, depending on how we translate κατέλαβεν. Christ as Logos/Light encounters substantial opposition in his descent; the entire Gospel, in fact, is fraught with themes of conflict, but also with reconciliation, justification and sacrifice—concepts quite foreign to the type of revelation we find in the *Trimorphic Protennoia*.[63] Against this adversarial status of the darkness in the Prologue,

---

[61] Epiphanius, *Panarion* 26.3.1.

[62] Elaine Pagels, "Exegesis of Genesis 1 in the Gospels of Thomas and John," *JBL* 118/3 (1999): 489.

[63] As R. van den Broek ("Von der jüdischen Weisheit," 98) points out, we also find this adversarial theme of Light Pronoia against the darkness in the Pronoia Hymn. In the first descent Pronoia hides herself because of the "wickedness" (κακία) she finds in the foundations of chaos. In her second descent, she runs back up to her root, before those who are held in chaos are destroyed "before the time." Van den Broek makes a convincing argument that 1 Enoch 42 furnishes the source for this scheme. The *Trimorphic Protennoia*, however, does not fit 1 Enoch 42 as neatly, partly because the adversarial theme of descent is largely absent, but also because the three, successive descents are more difficult to discern from one another, lacking the chronological markers πάλιν and ἔτι evident in the Pronoia Hymn. Again, this tells us only that these different texts work slightly differently with a similar set of traditions; it may suggest, as well, that the

Protennoia/Light encounters no significant opposition at the human level on her descent.[64] At the level of the Middle, the planetary beings do not correctly perceive Protennoia/Light, nor recognize the source of the sound which shakes them off their planetary courses (43:4-31). But the text is not truly anti-cosmic, nor is the opposition intense enough to force Protennoia up to her source in the Light; instead, her second descent sets the scene for her to effect the change necessary for the salvation of all humans by annulling the force of astral determinism.

Third, Evans' parallel, "I gave shape to those who took shape until their consummation" from *Trimorphic Protennoia* 47:12-13 seems to express only remotely the same idea as John 1:12, "as many as received him he gave authority to become children of God." Both lines express a central soteriology, the first as the eschatological act of "giving form or shape," the second through the conferral of authority (*exousia*). The language of image and likeness consolidates *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s connections to Genesis 1:26; the Prologue, by contrast, appears to back away from the Word's power to physically or spiritually transform. Spiritual transformation, the author of the Prologue emphasizes, can only be attained through belief into Christ, rather than through the recognition of one's inherent status as a light-being. Here again, the *Trimorphic Protennoia* appears to reflect a rather different way of understanding Genesis. God's use of the plural at 1:26, "let us create humankind in our image and likeness" could be interpreted as a second divine agency present alongside God at creation. Whoever was responsible for the doctrinal elaboration at 38:11 identifies Protennoia as not merely the co-creator but actually the embodiment of this "Image of the Invisible Spirit" (ⲦⲢⲒⲔⲞⲚ ⲘⲠⲚⲈⲨⲘⲀ ⲚⲀⲦⲚⲀⲨ).

In 1962, Hans-Martin Schenke traced discussions of Genesis 1:26's "image of God" through a wide variety of "gnostic" sources, including *Eugnostos*, the *Apocryphon of John*, *On the Origin of the World* and Irenaeus' account of "Ophite" and "Sethian" Biblical exegesis.[65] There he detected an exegetical

---

Trimorphic Protennoia draws more heavily upon a certain mode of interpreting Genesis than the Pronoia hymn, by emphasizing the indwelling character of the light in all beings rather than on the primordial conflict between light and dark.

[64] This point has been disputed by John Turner, who refers to Protennoia's second "failed descent" in the *Trimorphic Protennoia*: "*Trimorphic Protennoia*: Introduction," 393; see also Y. Janssens, "The Trimorphic Protennoia," 232.

[65] Hans-Martin Schenke, *Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Diskussion über die paulinische Anschauung von der Kirche als Leib Christi* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 420-37. See R. McL. Wilson, "The Early History of

pattern which runs throughout the second-century: properly read, Genesis advocated a restoration to one's primordial status as a Light-Being, created in the image of God. The recent research of Stevan Davies,[66] Steven Patterson, April De Conick,[67] and Elaine Pagels[68] reveals how this spiritual goal runs through the *Gospel of Thomas*. In Logion 83, for instance, these primordial light-images are "revealed to humankind, but the light in them remains concealed in the image of the light of the Father (ϩⲛ ⲧϩⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲟⲧ)." Following a similar interpretation of Gen 1:26, the author of a doctrinal section of the *Trimorphic Protennoia* articulates salvation for members of its community as a restoration to the primordial state of light-beings: "you will become gloriously glorious, the way you first were when you were light" (45:18-20). To effect this restoration, Protennoia enters "her own" as a hidden force, giving them an image (εἰκών) to transform them into "children of the light" (36:27; 40:30; 41:1). All members of the community, therefore, bear within themselves the divine imprint of the Father as well as the hidden force of the Mother.

A final point of contact concerns the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue's shared use of the term *skēnē* to describe the revealer's sojourn into a human body. John 1:14's "the Word became flesh and dwelt (ἐσκήνωσεν) among us" appears to parallel *Trimorphic Protennoia* 47:5-23, in which Protennoia reveals herself to her own "in their tents" (ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲕⲏⲛⲉ).[69] Unlike the prologue of John's gospel, however, Protennoia's third descent does not appear to have involved an incarnation. Instead, Protennoia manifests herself as the divine image within humankind: "I empowered them as the

---

the Exegesis of Gen 1:26," in *Texte und Untersuchungen* LXIII, *Studia Patristica* I (1957), 420-437 for the Patristic evidence; see also Jarl Fossum, "Gen 1,26 and 2,7 in Judaism, Samaritanism, and Gnosticism," *JSJ* 16/2 (1989): 202-239.

[66] Stevan Davies, "The Christology and Protology of the Gospel of Thomas," *JBL* 3.4 (1992): 663-684.

[67] April De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997).

[68] Pagels, "Exegesis of Genesis 1."

[69] Jan Helderman, who composed a detailed philological study to the background of the Coptic and Greek terms, interpreted the presence of the term σκηνή in *Trimorphic Protennoia* as evidence that its author "intentionally reinterpreted" John 1:14. Since, however, we find the term also used to refer to the human body in Corpus Hermeticum XIII, it seems precipitous to claim any direct literary dependency. See J. Helderman, "'In ihren Zelten . . .', Bemerkungen bei Codex XIII Nag Hammadi 47:14-18 im Hinblick auf John 1:14," in *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, ed. T. Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn, and W. C. van Unnik (Leiden, 1978) 1.189, 195 ff.; cited in Yamauchi, p. 48.

Word, and I revealed myself in the likeness of their shape" (47:15-16). This is no Johannine incarnational theology; it owes more to Genesis 1:26's creation of humankind through the divine image. Turner describes Protennoia/Logos elegantly as "the mode of revelation of God's thought to human minds."[70] Michael Waldstein expresses a similar observation concerning Pronoia's third descent into "the prison of the body" in the *Apocryphon of John*'s Providence monologue: "She addresses them at the point where *their* inner spark is held captive, in *their own* prison, the body."[71] The concept is far different than Jesus' salvific incarnation; instead it is about a transformation of individuals, an "empowerment" as individuals are transformed into children of God through the recognition of the divine Word/image within themselves.

Summary and Conclusions

Recently, the trend in scholarship has been to highlight not merely the existence of what Carsten Colpe termed "stupendous parallels" between ancient sources such as the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and John's gospel, but to reveal the way in which these texts responded polemically to the ideas which formed part of the intellectual *koine* of the Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman world.[72] These debates did not necessarily concern the exact meaning of Genesis 1-3, but the true nature of the redeemer—or better, the mechanics of redemption itself. Stephen Patterson and Helmut Koester, for instance, have both persuasively argued within the last decade that the author of John's gospel polemicizes against christological and protological concepts expressed in the *Gospel of Thomas*.[73] The manner in which Genesis was interpreted stood at the very heart of these theological debates.

---

[70] Turner, "Trimorphic Protennoia," 437.

[71] Waldstein, "The Providence Monologue in the Apocryphon of John and the Johannine Prologue," *JECS* 3:4 (1995): 380. See Waldstein's comments on Pronoia's third descent in the monologue, which has numerous points of contact with the *Trimorphic Protennoia*: "The Monologue itself, apart from its secondary context in the *Apocryphon of John*, does not suggest incarnation" (p. 381).

[72] I am indebted to Elaine Pagels for sharing with me her recent incisive and perceptive JBL article prior to its publication, in which she uncovers some of the same exegetical debates at work behind the Johannine Prologue and the Gospel of Thomas as I have highlighted here. Our discussions helped to confirm some of the insights that I had developed in researching and writing this article.

[73] Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1993); H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Trinity Press

What can we make of these contrasting traditions? All these points of departure between the *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue indicate that certain potent disputes concerning the nature of divine revelation were taking place in the centuries around the turning of the common era. For Hellenized Jews, the knowledge of who bore within themselves the divine image may have helped to delimit communities, or to distinguish themselves from gentile "Barbarians." Once the debate entered Christian circles, at stake was nothing less than the role of Christ in salvation. Yet as controversial and heated as these theological debates must have been, their import likely extended beyond theology. They surely had profound consequences for issues of leadership, authority, and community.

Although similar in form and language, the *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s orientation differs radically from the Johannine Prologue, which emphasizes the Word's descent into the cosmos but not its participation within all levels of cosmic beings. As the *Trimorphic Protennoia* was Christianized, later redactors took pains to lessen the theological differences between the two texts, primarily by asserting that Christ and Protennoia were not different divine beings, but different manifestations of God's only-begotten Son.

We can find traces of the same debate that undergirds this redactional concern as late as the early third century. In his polemical tractate *Against Praxeas*, Tertullian, attacked his theological opponent's interpretation of Genesis 1:3, by invoking the Johannine Prologue:

> Therefore, does the Word also Himself assume his own form and glorious garb (*speciem et ornatum*), his sound and vocal utterance (*sonum et vocem*), when God says, 'Let there be light.'[74]

Tertullian wished to clarify that the Word also embodied the form, the sound, the voice, and the speech in God's injunction. To clarify the hidden, christological significance of Genesis 1:3, he drew upon Wisdom traditions: "The Lord created or formed me as the beginning of His ways" (Pvb 8:22) and "When He prepared the heaven, I was present with Him"

International, 1991). See also Gregory J. Riley, Resurrection Reconsidered: Thomas and John in Controversy (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995). Ismo Dunderberg offers an important caveat, noting the complexity of oral and literary traditions in the text and the paucity of information on ancient communities, in "John and Thomas in Conflict?" in *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years: Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration*, eds. Anne McGuire and John D. Turner, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), 1-21.

[74] Tertullian, *Against Praxeas*, 7:1-6.

(Pvb 8:27). During the course of his invective, Tertullian expresses in very different form much of the terminology shared between *Trimorphic Protennoia* and the Prologue: Voice, God's invocation of primordial Light, Wisdom, the "first-begotten," the "form" and "glorious garb." At issue here may have been Praxeas' assertions that the Word was in some way subordinate to God—or just as shocking, to Wisdom. Tertullian endeavored to show, against Praxeas, that Wisdom was identical to the Word, as (properly interpreted) the Word was also identical to the Light God calls into being, and indeed, to the very substance of God's utterance itself. The exclusivity of Christ as Word could not be compromised by theologies that placed at their center a separate, superior Wisdom figure.

Other ancient interpreters of Genesis were careful to emphasize the same point. Origen, in his *Commentary on John* II.130-131 attacks the reading that "what was in him was Life": "Life was not in the Logos, but life was made, if indeed 'life is the light of humankind.'" He continues elsewhere, "This life indeed comes into existence after the Word, being inseparable from him after it has come into existence." He responds to Heracleon, who interpreted "in him" to be "in spiritual humans" and thus, the Logos to be identical to the community of spirituals.[75] It was important to emphasize that the Logos existed quite separately from human communities. Heracleon's perspective here appears remarkably consonant with the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, which states categorically that Protennoia/Logos indwells her own.

My intention in this paper has been to nuance the observation that there exist "stupendous parallels" between the Johannine Prologue and the *Trimorphic Protennoia*, and to provide a direction for further work on the relationship between the two texts, based not just on a quest for parallels but on a deeper understanding of the manner in which both drew upon (often conflicting) traditions of Genesis interpretations. I have sought to locate the *Trimorphic Protennoia*'s revelatory framework and soteriology within broader debates on the nature of the cosmos and salvation, often expressed through differing interpretations of Genesis. We're left with some intriguing questions. Why the concern with protology we find in both texts? And if what's at issue is God's injunction at 1:3, why did certain communities

---

[75] *Comm. on Joh.* II.137 (trans. R. E. Heine, 131.) For some Patristic and "Gnostic" exegeses of the Johannine Prologue, see Anne Pasquier, "Interpretation of the Prologue to John's Gospel in Some Gnostic and Patristic Writings: A Common Tradition," in *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years*, 484-495.

apparently interpret this injunction as a metaphor for salvation rather than a creation myth? Beyond these questions, we know only that communities and authors actively debated who among them had been elected to discern the Voice of the Father, who bore the divine image, and ultimately, into which form or image their savior had descended to the world.

Skidmore College
Saratoga Springs, NY
U.S.A.

THEKLA UND DIE ROBBEN

VON

HORST SCHNEIDER

Einleitung

Nachdem Thekla[1] im Theater Antiochiens[2] den ersten Ansturm wilder Tiere durch die wunderbare Hilfe einer Löwin überlebt hat, die dabei selbst getötet wird, werden immer mehr wilde Tiere in die Arena hineingelassen. Daraufhin breitet Thekla ihre Hände aus, betet zu Gott und stürzt sich mit den Worten: „Im Namen von Jesus Christus taufe ich mich am letzten[3] Tag" zum Entsetzen der zuschauenden Frauen, die sie von diesem

---

[1] Überblick über die Forschung zu den Thekla-Akten und deutsche Übersetzung bei W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* Bd. 2, Tübingen 1989, 193-243. Neuere Beiträge zu den Thekla-Akten: M. P. Aymer, Hailstorms and fireballs: redaction, world and resistance in the „Acts of Paul and Thecla", in: *Semeia* 79 (1997) 45-61; J. A. Artés Hernández, Gnosis y acta apostolorum apocrypha: „Hechos de Pablo y Tecla" y „Martirio de Pedro", in: *Estudios biblicos* 55 (1997) 387-392; L. C. Boughton, From pious legend to feminist fantasy: distinguishing hagiographical license from apostolic practice in the „Acts of Paul/Acts of Thecla", in: *Journal of religion* 71 (1991) 362; J. N. Bremmer (Hrsg.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Kampen 1996 (mit Bibliographie); K. Cooper, A saint in exile: the early medieval Thecla at Rome and Meriamlik, in: *Hagiographica* 2 (1995) 1-23; J. K. Elliott, The influence of the Apocrypha on manuscripts of the New Testament, in: *Apocrypha* 8 (1997) 265-271; L. Hayne, Thecla and the Church Fathers, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 48 (1994) 209; F. Hild, Art. Hagia Thekla, in: *Der neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike* (hrsg. von H. Cancik und H. Schneider. Altertum Bd. 5, Stuttgart/Weimar 1998, 77; A. Jensen, Thekla: die Apostolin (= Frauen-Kultur-Geschichte 3) Freiburg 1995 (dt. Übersetzung mit Kommentar); G. Röwekamp, Art. Thekla-Akten, in: LACL ²1999, 589f.; J. A. Trumbower, Acts of Paul and Tecla 28-31, in: *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine* (hrsg. von M. Kiley u.a.) London/New York 1997, 280-287; R. McL. Wilson, Anonymous, The Acts of Paul and Thecla, in: *Anthology of ancient Greek popular literature* (hrsg. von W. Hansen), Indianapolis 1998, 50-63. Zum Text siehe unten Fußnote 3.

[2] Es ist nicht klar, welches Antiochien gemeint ist, das syrische oder das pisidische, vgl. Schneemelcher, 199.201.

[3] Das Adjektiv ὑστέρᾳ hat hier superlativische Bedeutung; vgl. W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 6. völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage von K. und B. Aland, Berlin/New York, 1988, 1693 s.v. ὕστερος 1 b und 2 b.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Schritt abhalten wollen, todesmutig in ein Wasserbecken mit Robben. Doch die Robben sehen zum Erstaunen des Publikums eine blitzartige Lichterscheinung und treiben dann tot auf dem Wasser. Ein Wunder ist hier gewirkt worden. So jedenfalls der Duktus des Erzählers. Noch weitere Wunder ereignen sich, bis Thekla schließlich freigelassen wird.

Acta Pauli et Theclae 34 (260f Lipsius/Bonnet):[4] Τότε εἰσβάλλουσιν πολλὰ θηρία ἐστώσης αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκτετακυίας τὰς χείρας καὶ προσευχομένης. Ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσεν τὴν προσευχήν, ἐστράφη καὶ ἴδεν ὄρυγμα μέγα πλῆρες ὕδατος καὶ εἶπεν· „Νῦν καιρὸς λούσασθαί με." Καὶ ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὴν λέγουσα· „Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ ὑστέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ βαπτίζομαι." Καὶ ἰδοῦσαι αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἔκλαυσαν λέγοντες· „Μὴ βάλῃς ἑαυτὴν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ," ὥστε καὶ τὸν ἡγεμόνα δακρῦσαι, ὅτι τοιοῦτον κάλλος φῶκαι ἔμελλον ἐσθίειν. Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὴν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Αἱ δὲ φῶκαι πυρὸς ἀστραπῆς φέγγος ἰδοῦσαι νεκραὶ ἐπέπλευσαν. Καὶ ἦν περὶ αὐτὴν νεφέλη πυρός, ὥστε μήτε τὰ θηρία ἅπτεσθαι αὐτῆς μήτε θεωρεῖσθαι αὐτὴν γυμνήν.

Auch der moderne Leser staunt über diese Geschichte, einerseits, weil sich Thekla hier in spektakulärer Weise selbst tauft, andererseits, weil die Robben – die doch eigentlich verträgliche und harmlose Tiere sind – hier als wilde Bestien eingeführt werden, die nur durch das göttliche Wunder daran gehindert werden, Thekla, die treue Begleiterin des Paulus, zu zerreißen und aufzufressen.

Dem einigermaßen gebildeten antiken Leser mußte dies ebenfalls seltsam vorkommen, da die Harmlosigkeit der Robbe[5] dem Menschen gegen-

---

[4] Der Text nach der immer noch grundlegenden, allerdings verbesserungswürdigen Ausgabe von R. A. Lipsius/M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Leipzig 1891, T.1, 260f. Interpunktion und Groß- und Kleinschreibung wurden geändert. Lipsius' Edition fußte auf elf griechischen Handschriften sowie lateinischen, syrischen, slavischen und arabischen Versionen. Im koptischen Papyrus aus Heidelberg fehlen leider die entsprechenden Sätze, in denen die Robben erwähnt werden; vgl. C. Schmidt, *Acta Pauli. Aus der Heidelberger koptischen Papyrushandschrift Nr.1*, Leipzig 1905, 48f. Zur Ausgabe von Lipsius siehe ebd. 145f. Im griechischen Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek fehlt die Thekla-Episode; vgl. C. Schmidt/W. Schubart, *Πράξεις Παύλου. Acta Pauli. Nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, Glücksstadt/Hamburg 1936. Die lateinischen Versionen hat Gebhardt untersucht. Er kommt zu dem Ergebnis, daß es mindestens vier verschiedene, voneinander unabhängige lateinische Übersetzungen gab; vgl. O. von Gebhardt, *Die lateinischen Übersetzungen der Acta Pauli et Theclae* (= TU NF 7,2) Leipzig 1902. Ein weitere kritische Ausgabe der Paulusakten bietet L. Vouaux, *Les Actes de Paul et ses Lettres Apocryphes*, Paris 1913; vgl. dort zu Theklas Sprung ins Wasserbecken 210-212. Vgl. zur Überlieferung allgemein Schneemelcher,2,197.

[5] Vgl. G. Dagron, *Vie et miracles de Sainte Thècle*, Brüssel 1978, 251 Anm. 5: „Les phoques n'ont pas, dans l'antiquité, cette reputation injustifiée d'être des bêtes dangereuses."; zur Robbe in der Antike siehe H. Gossen, Art. Robbe, in: *RE* 2,1 (1914) 945-949;

über in der Antike durchaus bekannt war. So berichtet z.B. Plin. *nat.* 9,41 (vgl. 10,128), daß Robben zu den Tieren gehörten, die dressiert werden konnten. Iuvenal spielt an einer Stelle auf die Trägheit dieser Tiere an, die tagsüber an Land stets tief und fest zu schlafen schienen: Der Lärm der Straße werde selbst Drusus – gemeint ist der für seine Schläfrigkeit bekannte Kaiser Claudius[6] – und den Robben den Schlaf rauben (Iuv. 3,238; vgl. Verg. *georg.* 4, 432). Nach Plinius habe sogar kein Tier einen tieferen Schlaf als die Robbe.[7]

Die Robbe[8] – griechisch φώκη, latinisiert *phoca* oder in lateinischer Periphrase *vitulus marinus* („Meerkalb") – wird bereits bei Homer in der Proteussage erwähnt (*Od.* 4,404.411.436.442.448.450), später z.B. bei Aristophanes (*Vespae* 1035; *Pax* 758). Von Aischylos ist überliefert, daß er im Jahre 458 ein Satyrspiel „Proteus" im Anschluß an die Orestie aufgeführt hat, in dem wahrscheinlich Robben auftraten.[9] Im Mittelmeerraum war die Robbe vor allem in der Ägäis anzutreffen. Auch auf Münzen wurden Robben dargestellt.[10] Allein in Plinius' Naturgeschichte wird die Robbe mehr als 20mal genannt.[11] Auch in medizinischen Zusammenhängen wurde die Robbe häufig erwähnt, da das von ihr abgesonderte Lab[12] ebenso wie das Robbenfett[13] zu mannigfachen therapeutischen Zwecken verwendet

---

O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, Bd. 1, Leipzig 1903, 407f; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Tierwelt der Antike*, Mainz 1983, 194f.

[6] Vgl. E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980, 187.

[7] Vgl. Plin. nat. 9,42: *nullum animal graviore somno premitur.*

[8] Genauer gesagt die Mönchsrobbe, die heute vom Aussterben bedroht ist; vgl. R. Duguy/D. Marchessaux, Monus monachus – Mönchsrobbe, in: *Handbuch der Säugetiere Europas* (hrsg. von J. Niethammer/F. Krapp, Bd. 6/2 Meeressäuger: Robben) Wiesbaden 1992, 250-267; ebd. 262: „Mönchsrobben sind dem Menschen gegenüber ohne jegliche Aggressivität, wenigstens in ungestörten Kolonien, wo man sich den Tieren, wenn sie an Land sind, nähern kann, bis man sie berührt." E. Mohr, *Die Robben der europäischen Gewässer* (= Monographien der Wildsäugetiere Bd. 12, hrsg. von D. Müller-Using), Frankfurt 1952, 222-228.

[9] Vgl. Aischylos, *hypoth. Agmemn.* (190,25 West); siehe R. Krumeich/N. Pechstein/B. Seidensticker, *Das griechische Satyrspiel*, Darmstadt 1999, 179-181.

[10] Vgl. F. Imhoof-Blumer/O. Keller, *Tier- und Pflanzenbilder auf Münzen und Gemmen*, Leipzig 1889, 4,22-24.

[11] Vgl. Plin. *nat.* 1,8a.9a.32a; 2,146; 8,111; 9,19.41f.50; 10,128.178; 11,136.151.171.195.206.215; 26, 113f.235; 28,96; 32,57.83.110.112.130.

[12] Vgl. zum Lab der Robbe als Heilmittel z.B. Plin. *nat.* 26,23 (gegen Angina); 32,116 (gegen Lethargie); 32,120 (gegen Starrkrampf); Plin. *nat.* 26,113f; 32,112, Thphr. *HP* 9,11,3, Ael. *NA* 3,19 (gegen Epilepsie).

[13] Zum Robbenfett als Therapeutikum vgl. z.B. Plin. *nat.* 32,110 (gegen Podagra); 32,57 (gegen Tollwut); 32,83 (gegen Flechten und Aussatz).

wurde. Die antike Naturwissenschaft war besonders an der amphibischen Lebensweise der Robbe interessiert, die ja ihr Leben sowohl zu Wasser als auch zu Lande verbringt (vgl. z.B. Arist. *hist. anim.* 566b 28ff).

Wie soll man also diesen Widerspruch zwischen allseits bekannter Harmlosigkeit der Robbe und ihrer vermeintlichen Gefährlichkeit in den Thekla-Akten verstehen?[14]

Ein Überlieferungsfehler in den Thekla-Akten (z.B. τέρας, κῆτος im Sinne von Meeresungeheuer o.ä. statt Robbe) dürfte eher unwahrscheinlich sein, da die Handschriften der Thekla-Akten an dieser Stelle nicht voneinander abweichen.[15] Gestützt wird dieser Befund auch durch die Nebenüberlieferung. So spielt z.B. der Physiologus an einer Stelle auf Theklas Sprung in das Robbenbecken an; Kap. 40 „Ibis" (124 Sbordone):[16] Μωϋσῆς, ἐκτείνας τὰς χεῖρας, ἀνεῖλε τὸν Ἀμαλήκ, Δανιὴλ τοὺς λέοντας. Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους, Θέκλα ἐν πυρὶ καὶ θηρίοις καὶ φώκαις ἐβλήθη, καὶ ὁ τύπος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτὴν διέσωσε. Dabei stellt der Physiologus die Thekla-Episode – sofern es sich hier nicht um eine Interpolation handelt[17] – in eine Reihe mit berühmten Beispielen aus der alttestamentlichen Tradition: Mose und Amalek (vgl. Ex 17,8-16), Daniel in der Löwengrube (vgl. Dan 6) sowie Jona und der Wal (vgl. Jona 2). Nach dem Thekla-Exempel wird die Reihe dann noch fortgesetzt mit Susanna vor den lüsternen Greisen (vgl. Dan 13), Judit und Holofernes (vgl. Jdt 13), Ester und Artaxerxes (vgl. Est 5-8) sowie schließlich den drei Jünglingen im Feuerofen (vgl. Dan 3).

Auch der anonyme Verfasser einer hagiographischen Schrift über das Leben und die Wunder Theklas, der wohl aus dem Kreis des Basilius von Seleukia (5. Jh.) stammt, kennt die Robben aus den Thekla-Akten und hebt

---

[14] Vgl. C. Nauerth/R. Warns, *Thekla, Ihre Bilder in der frühchristlichen Kunst* (= Göttinger Orientforschungen II,3), Wiesbaden 1981, 67: „. . . wen könnten die harmlosen, schläfrigen Tiere schrecken?"

[15] Vgl. *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 34 (Lipsius/Bonnet 1, 260f). Die Textverderbnis eines Wortes aus einer lateinischen oder griechischen Vorbildstelle kann hier wohl ausgeschlossen werden, denn welche Quelle bzw. welches Wort sollte dies sein?

[16] F. Sbordone, *Physiologus*, Rom 1936.

[17] Zu Ἰωνᾶς ist wohl ἐβλήθη aus dem nachfolgenden Satz sinngemäß zu ergänzen. Jona wurde also in den Bauch des Wals geworfen (so der Text wörtlich). Es fehlt hier allerdings ein Hinweis auf seine Rettung. Thekla wurde auf den Scheiterhaufen gestellt und den wilden Tieren bzw. den Robben ausgeliefert. Ihr Gebet zu Christus bzw. das Kreuzzeichen rettete sie. Die Erwähnung Theklas ist das einzige christliche Exempel in der alttestamentlichen Beispielreihe der Ibis-Hermeneia im Physiologus, aber auch das einzige Beispiel, das ein christliches Kreuzzeichen zeigt, von dem zuvor im Physiologustext ausdrücklich die Rede war.

ihre Gefährlichkeit besonders hervor: ... ὁρᾷ (sc. Thekla) κολυμβήθηραν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ φῶκας ἐννηχομένας, θηρία μέν ὄντα καὶ αὐτὰ θαλάττια καὶ ἀνδρόφονα ... (250 Dagron). Die beiden byzantinischen Autoren aus dem 9./10. Jh. Niketas Paphlagon, *Oratio 16 in laudem sanctae Theclae* (PG 105,325) und Symeon Metaphrastes, *Martyrium Sanctae Theclae* 10 (PG 115,897) erwähnen die Robben ebenfalls in ihren enkomiastischen Thekla-Schriften.

Daß an unserer Stelle der Thekla-Akten anstelle von Robben „Haie" (κύνες θαλάσσιοι oder *canes marini*) gemeint sein könnten – so P. Brown, G. Dagron oder C. Nauerth/R. Warns[18] –, scheidet aufgrund der eindeutigen Überlieferungslage und des semantischen Gehalts des Wortes φώκη ebenfalls aus. Man löst das Problem, das schon viele Gelehrte verblüffte,[19] auch nicht dadurch, daß man den Begriff „Robbe" z.B. in neutraler Weise mit *bestia marina* oder „Seetier" umschreibt oder noch andere Seeungeheuer hinzufügt.[20] Es genügt auch nicht der Hinweis auf das Auftreten von Robben bei Zirkusspielen (belegt bei Calp. *ecl.* 7,64-66), um zu erklären, warum der Verfasser an dieser Stelle seiner Erzählung ausgerechnet diese Meerestiere als wilde Bestien einführt, obwohl ihre Harmlosigkeit bekannt war.[21]

Das Problem hatte auch Auswirkungen auf die Ikonographie der Thekla-Geschichte. So war eine ikonographische Darstellung von Theklas Sprung ins Robbenbassin möglicherweise Vorbild für ein koptisches Kalksteinrelief aus dem Brooklyn-Museum in New York.[22] Die Haltung Theklas in dem Relief mit hochgereckten Armen entspricht gerade der Art, wie man von

---

[18] Vgl. P. Brown, *Die Keuschheit der Engel*, München/Wien, 1991, 172; Dagron, 251 Anm. 5: „Y a-t-il dans les *Actes* apocryphes, que notre auteur se contente de suivre, une confusion avec les squales?"; Nauerth/Warns, 67: „Der Verfasser der Acta und die Leser werden sich die Robben wohl als See-'Hunde' und Meer-'Wölfe' gedacht haben."

[19] Vgl. A. Scott, The Date of the Physiologus, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 4 (1998) 438: „Many manuscripts of the *Physiologus* even refer (ch. 40) to the seals which threatened Thecla in the *Acts of Paul*, a text which has long puzzled scholars ..."

[20] J. Leibrand, Art. Thekla von Ikonium, in: *LCI* 8 (1976) 432,436, behilft sich bei der Paraphrase der Geschichte, indem der Begriff „Robbe" durch „Seetier" ersetzt wird. Ähnlich verfuhren lateinische Übersetzungen, die statt *focae marinae* oder *vituli marini, bestiae* oder *belvae marinae, volucres* oder *serpentes* übersetzten (1,260f Lipsius/Bonnet; Gebhardt, 92-95; 154). Photius erweiterte in *Homilie 19* (Enkomion auf Thekla) einfach die Anzahl der Seetiere: φῶκαί τε καὶ ἄλλα τῶν ἐναλίων θηρῶν (184 Laourdas).

[21] J. N. Bremmer, Magic, Martyrdom and women's liberation in The Acts of Paul and Thecla, in: *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla* (hrsg.v. dems.), 54; vgl. B. Lavagnini, S. Tecla nella vasca delle foche e gli spettacoli in acqua, in: *Byzantion* 33 (1963) 185-190.

[22] Die Datierung des Reliefs schwankt zwischen dem 6. und 9. Jh.; vgl. Nauerth/Warns 63.

oben in ein Gewässer hinabspringt. Die fließenden Linien des Blattwerks der Büsche und Bäume kann man sich leicht als Wellen des Robbenbeckens vorstellen. Die anstürmenden Hunde oder Wölfe könnten den Platz der Robben eingenommen haben.[23]

Der anonyme Künstler, der den Thekla-Zyklus schuf, der auf dem Antependium des romanischen Altars in der Kathedrale von Tarragona (13. Jh.) abgebildet ist, entschied sich für zwei Gruppen von ganz unterschiedlich aussehenden Tieren, deren Deutung umstritten ist. Bei der Darstellung von Theklas Sprung ins Wasser umgab er sie oben mit zwei symmetrisch angeordneten Tieren, die Robben sein könnten (so Vilaró) oder „Riesenunken" (nach Nauerth/Warns), von unten aber ließ er sie von schlangenähnlichen Bestien (Vilaró) bzw. Robben (Nauerth/Warns) angreifen.[24] Auch auf dem gotischen Retabel in derselben Kathedrale findet sich eine Thekla-Darstellung, die zeigt, wie sie im Wasser Schlangen und anderen Ungeheuern ausgesetzt ist („Thekla im Schlangenpfuhl"). Diese wurde von Pere Joan de Vallfogona im 15. Jahrhundert angefertigt. Allerdings fliehen die Meeresungeheuer hier von Thekla weg.[25]

Im folgenden soll untersucht werden, welche Motive den Verfasser der *Acta Pauli et Theclae* allem Anschein nach dazu führten, die Robben auszuwählen, um durch sie einerseits das Wunder göttlicher Errettung einer Heiligen aus Todesgefahr darzustellen, andererseits Theklas Taufe in spektakulärer Weise zu inszenieren. Dabei sollen in einem ersten Schritt a) aussagekräftige Stellen aus bekannten Werken antiker Autoren deutlich machen, welche Vorstellungen über die Robben durch die antike Literatur vermittelt wurden, und b) sollen die Voraussetzungen aus der paganen Mythologie beleuchtet werden. In einem zweiten Schritt soll dann die Thekla-Episode im Kontext ihrer historischen Bedingungen analysiert werden.

1.a. *Signifikante Stellen über Robben in der antiken Literatur*

In der bereits erwähnten Proteusgeschichte,[26] die Menelaos Telemach im 4. Buch der Odyssee erzählt, wird die Robbe zum ersten Mal in der

---

[23] Vgl. Nauert/Warns, 67f. und Abb. 23f.

[24] Vgl. J. S. Vilaró, La iconografia Tarraconense de santa Tecla y sus fuentes litterarias, in: *Boletín Arqueológico* 52 (1952) 113-136; bes. 133 und Tafel 12; Nauerth/Warns, 90 mit Abb. 31.

[25] Vgl. R. Warns, Weitere Darstellungen der heiligen Thekla, in: *Göttinger Orientforschungen* 2,8 (hrsg. von G. Koch), Wiesbaden 1986, 123-126 und Tafel 34,1.

[26] Vgl. H. Herter, Art. Proteus, in: *RE* 23,1 (1957) 940-975.

griechischen Literatur genannt (vgl. *Od.* 4,363-572). Als Menelaos wegen einer Flaute auf der Insel Pharos festsaß, weil die Götter seine Weiterfahrt verhinderten, kam ihm die Tochter des Proteus, Eudothea, mit einer List zu Hilfe. Sie hatte nämlich als einzige von den Göttern Mitleid mit ihm. Auf den Rat der Eudothea hin legte sich Menelaos abends zusammen mit drei ausgewählten Gefährten in die Sanddünen, um dort zu schlafen. Am nächsten Morgen ging er mit seinen Leuten zum Strand und betete inständig zu den Göttern. In der Zwischenzeit hatte Eudothea an der Stelle am Meeresstrand, wo Proteus mit seinen Robben, die er wie eine Schafherde hütete, zu schlafen pflegte, Mulden in den Sand gegraben und frisch abgezogene Robbenfelle mitgebracht. So vorbereitet erwartete sie dort Menelaos und seine Gefährten. Als sie dann gekommen waren, wurden sie von Eudothea in die Mulden gebettet und zu ihrer Tarnung mit den Robbenfellen zugedeckt. Diese verströmten jedoch einen unaustehlichen Gestank (*Od.* 4,442 ὀλοώτατος ὀδμή). Menelaos kommentierte dies mit folgenden Worten: „Wer möchte sich schon bei einem Meeresungeheuer schlafen legen?" (*Od.* 4,443 τίς γάρ κ' εἰναλίῳ παρὰ κήτεϊ κοιμηθείη;). Doch Eudothea wußte Abhilfe zu schaffen. Sie schmierte (*Od.* 445 θῆκε) jedem Ambrosia unter die Nase und machte so den Gestank des Ungeheuers zunichte (*Od.* 4,446 ὄλεσσε δὲ κήτεος ὀδμήν). Den ganzen Morgen über kamen Robben an den Strand und legten sich dort nieder. Endlich kam auch Proteus in der Mittagszeit aus dem Meer, um Siesta zu halten, und legte sich, nachdem er die Robben abgezählt hatte, in ihrer Mitte schlafen, ohne die List des Menelaos zu bemerken. Denn er zählte sogar Menelaos und seine Gefährten als erste zu den Untieren (*Od.* 4,452 ἐν δ' ἡμέας πρώτους λέγε κήτεσιν). Sobald er sich hingelegt hatte, sprangen Menelaos und seine Gefährten laut schreiend auf, überwältigten ihn und zwangen ihn, den Grund zu nennen, warum die Götter ihre Weiterfahrt verhinderten (vgl. *Od.* 4, 363-459).

Es fällt auf, daß die Robbe in der Odyssee aus Menelaos Blickwinkel, das heißt aus menschlicher Perspektive, unter die Meeresungeheuer gezählt wird – sie wird dreimal abschätzig als κῆτος[27] bezeichnet – und einen für die Menschen fürchterlichen Gestank verströmt, gegen den man nur mit göttlicher Hilfe (Eudotheas Ambrosia) bestehen kann. Homer zeichnet hier also ein unheimliches und eher abstoßendes Bild von der Robbe. Auch die

[27] Mit κῆτος wird jede Art von unheimlichem großem Meerestier oder -ungeheuer bei Homer bezeichnet; vgl. *Od.* 12,97 (Skylla frißt Delphine, Haie und andere Ungeheuer); siehe B. Mader, *LfgrE* 2 (1991) 1413f s.v. κῆτος und *L.S.J.* 949 s.v. κῆτος: „any seamonster or huge fish".

Stelle *Od.* 15,480 paßt in diesen Zusammenhang. Dort heißt es, daß die von Artemis getötete Frau ins Meer geworfen wurde, damit sie Robben und Fischen zur Beute würde.[28] An einer anderen Stelle befürchtet Odysseus, ein δαίμων (sc. Poseidon) könnte ein Meeresungeheuer (μέγα κῆτος) auf ihn hetzen (*Od.* 5,421). Mit dem Begriff κῆτος verbindet Odysseus hier also auch den Aspekt der Gefahr für Leib und Leben. In negativem Kontext taucht die Robbe auch an den beiden weiter oben schon erwähnten Stellen aus der Polemik des Aristophanes gegen Kleon auf. Dieser wird als Ungeheuer (τέρας) verunglimpft, das wie eine Robbe stinke.[29] In den angeführten Stellen werden Robben also offenbar als unheimliche und stinkende Tiere eingeschätzt, die zu den Ungeheuern des Meeres gehören.[30] Dabei wird man zumindest die Proteusgeschichte bei vielen griechischsprachigen Menschen der Antike als bekannt voraussetzen dürfen, da Homer noch bis weit in die Spätantike hinein zum elementaren Bildungsprogramm gehörte.[31] Diese Einschätzung bestätigt ausdrücklich Plin. *nat.* 32,144. Dort werden die Robben als *celebres Homero vituli* bezeichnet.

---

[28] *Od.* 15.478-481: τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα γυναῖκα βάλ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα, | ἄντλῳ δ' ἐνδούπησε πεσοῦσ' ὡς εἰναλίη κήξ. | καὶ τὴν μὲν φώκῃσι καὶ ἰχθύσι κύρμα γενέσθαι | ἔκβαλον· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ λιπόμην ἀκαχήμενος ἦτορ.

[29] Vgl. Aristophanes, *Vespae* 1033-1037: ἑκατὸν δὲ κύκλῳ κεφαλαὶ κολάκων οἰμωξομένων ἑλιχμῶντο | περὶ τὴν κεφαλήν, φωνὴν δ' εἶχεν χαράδρας ὄλεθρον τετοκυίας, | φώκης δ' ὀσμήν, Λαμίας δ' ὄρχεις ἀπλύτους, πρωκτὸν δὲ καμήλου. | τοιοῦτον ἰδὼν τέρας οὔ φησιν δείσας καταδωροδοκῆσαι, | ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔτι καὶ νυνὶ πολεμεῖ. Vgl. *Pax* 755-760.

[30] Zu diesem Ergebnis kommen auch M. Detienne/J. P. Vernant, *Cunning intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, Hassocks 1978, 258-275, die viele interessante Stellen über Robben interpretieren, allerdings bisweilen etwas mehr in die von ihnen zitierten Stellen hineinzulegen scheinen als diese tatsächlich bieten. Der folgende Abschnitt, ebd. 265, macht dies deutlich: „So one image of the seal is that of a philanthropic animal with close affinities with the human race. But in another set of texts it is a misanthropic creature, a distant inhabitant of the depths of the sea, one of the group of animals considered impure and wicked. When it rises from the sea, this monster of the deeps seems to be returning from the Beyond. It has a strong smell, the smell of the abyss. It gives off an odour of death which can only be dispelled by ambrosia, the life-giving fragrance of the Immortals." Außerdem machen Detienne/Vernant, 258-275, auf die Gemeinsamkeiten der Robben mit den Telchinen aufmerksam.

[31] Ein schönes Beispiel dafür gibt P. Brown, *Macht und Rhetorik in der Spätantike*, München 1995, 57. In der Auseinandersetzung mit juristischen Beratern eines neu eingesetzten Statthalters stellte Libanios die entscheidende Frage, die die weitere Atmosphäre der Gespräche auf lange Sicht bestimmen sollte: „Wie herrschte Odysseus als König über Ithaka?" Die prompte Antwort war: „Gütig wie ein Vater". Vgl. Libanios, *or.* 46,3 mit

1.b. *Mythologische Exempla*

Pagane Vorbilder für Theklas Auseinandersetzung mit den Meeresungeheuern bot der Hesione/Andromeda-Mythos. Berühmt war das Meeresungeheuer (κῆτος), das Poseidon nach Troja schickte, weil er von Laomedon um den Lohn für die Erbauung der Stadtmauer betrogen worden war, und dem Hesione, die Tochter des Laomedon, nach einem Orakelspruch ausgeliefert werden sollte (vgl. *Il.* 20,147). Auch Andromeda sollte einem menschenfressenden Meeresungeheuer (κῆτος) geopfert werden, das Poseidon wegen ihrer Hybris – sie hatte sich gerühmt, so schön zu sein wie die Nereiden – geschickt hatte (vgl. Eur. *fr.* 121[395 Nauck]). Daß man die christliche Heilige Thekla mit Hesione und Andromeda in der Spätantike in Verbindung brachte, ist aus der christlichen Ikonographie bekannt.[32] Während Andromeda und Hesione durch Perseus bzw. Herakles gerettet wurden, wird Thekla durch das Eingreifen des christlichen Gottes vor den Robben bewahrt.

2. *Historischer Kontext*

Der Versuch, die treue Anhängerin des Apostels Paulus im Theater hinzurichten, wird in den Paulus-Thekla-Akten mit den üblichen Details, die normalerweise zu den zirzensischen Tierhatzen und Tierkämpfen gehörten, geschildert. Löwen und alle möglichen anderen Arten von wilden Tieren treten auf. Da insbesondere auch Bären vorkommen, drängt sich im Zusammenhang mit Theklas Sprung ins Robbenbecken der Gedanke an die in Zirkusspielen aus der Kaiserzeit durchaus belegten Kämpfe zwischen Bären und Robben auf.[33] Dies bezeugt ausdrücklich – wie man bereits gesehen hat (s.o.) – Calp. *ecl.* 7,64-66: *nec solum nobis silvestria cernere monstra | contigit: aequoreos ego cum certantibus ursis | spectavi vitulos.* Calpurnius Siculus berichtet hier – wenn die zeitliche Einordnung in die neronische

---

Bezug auf Od. 2.233f: ὡς οὔ τις μέμνηται Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο | λαῶν, οἷσιν ἀνάσσε, πατὴρ δ' ὃς ἤπιος ἦεν. Vgl. zu Homer in der christlichen Antike G. M. Bartelink, Art. Homer, in: *RAC* 16 (1994) 116-147.

[32] Vgl. F. Bubel, *Euripides, Andromeda* (= Palingenesia 34, hrsg. von O. Lendle/P. Steinmetz), Stuttgart 1991, 108f; 118f. Zu Parallelen in der ikonographischen Darstellung von Thekla und Hesione bzw. Andromeda vgl. Nauerth/Warns 38.

[33] Vgl. Oppian. *hal.* 5,38-40 (Feindschaft zwischen Robben und Bären): φώκην δὲ βλοσυρὴν καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ χαιτήεσσαι, | ἄρκτοι πεφρίκασι καὶ ἐς μόθον ἀντιόωσαι | δάμνανται.

Zeit stimmt[34] – von den ersten Spielen,[35] die Nero im Jahre 57 in einem neu erbauten und allseits bewunderten hölzernen Amphitheater abhalten ließ.[36] Die Wortwahl des Calpurnius (*monstra*) bestätigt den unheimlichen Eindruck, den ein antiker Betrachter von dieser Spezies gewinnen konnte. Dabei knüpft Calpurnius offenbar an Verg. *georg.* 4,395 (*turpis . . . phocas*, im Anschluß an Homers Proteussage) und Ov. *met.* 1,300 (*deformes . . . phocae*) an, die die Häßlichkeit der Robben bereits hervorgehoben hatten. Daß sich bei dieser ungleichen Kampfpaarung unter bekannten Namen fremdartige Tiere (z.B. Eisbär[37] und Walroß) verbargen – wie man vermutet hat[38]–, erscheint unwahrscheinlich. Wie und woher hätten Eis- oder Polarbären bzw. Walrosse nach Rom kommen sollen? Daß man auch ungleiche Kampfpaarungen im Zirkus zusammenstellte, entsprang letztlich dem Bedürfnis nach Abwechslung, weil man immer neue Attraktionen für das verwöhnte Publikum im Programm bieten wollte.[39] Das Motiv vom Bären- und Robbenkampf bildet in der Thekla-Geschichte also den situativen Hintergrund für Theklas Wagemut, sich den vermeintlich gefährlichen Robben auszusetzen. Blutige Spiele waren im Zirkus zur Zeit der Abfassung der Thekla-Akten (vielleicht 185-195)[40] sicher noch üblich.

Auffallend ist außerdem, daß die Robben das Licht eines Blitzes sehen – gemeint ist wohl Theklas lichtvolle und reine Gestalt während ihres Sprungs – und dann tot auf der Wasseroberfläche umhertreiben, oder einfacher ausgedrückt: sie werden von einem Blitz erschlagen. Dies hängt vielleicht mit dem antiken Aberglauben zusammen, der mit den Robben verknüpft

---

[34] Diese Datierung ist allerdings umstritten; vgl. E. Champlin, History and the date of Calpurnius Siculus: *Philologus* 130 (1986) 104-112.

[35] Eine umfassende Analyse von zirzensischen Wasserspielen, Naumachien in Rom etc. bei K. M. Coleman, Launching into history: aquatic displays in the early empire, in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 83 (1993) 48-74.

[36] Vgl. Suet. *Nero* 12,4: „Nero . . . exhibuit et naumachiam marina aqua innantibus belvis . . ."; und Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 61,9: . . . εἶτα πληρώσας (sc. Nero) ἐξαίφνης τὸ θέατρον ὕδατος θαλασσίου ὥστε καὶ ἰχθύας καὶ κήτη ἐν αὐτῷ νήχεσθαι . . . Vgl. L. di Salvo, *T. Calpurnio Siculo, Ecloga VII*, Bologna 1990, 120-122; Chr. Gnilka, Die Tiere im hölzernen Amphitheater Neros, in: *Wiener Studien* 8 (1974) 124-153.

[37] Vgl. di Salvo, 120-122.

[38] Vgl. G. Jennison, *Animals for show and pleasure in ancient Rome*, Manchester 1937, 188f; Gnilka, 134f; Keller, 407f; Toynbee, 194f.

[39] Vgl. F. Drexel, Über die bei den römischen Venationen verwandten Tiere, in: *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte* Roms (von L. Friedländer), Bd. 4: Anhänge, Leipzig 1921, 268-275.

[40] Vgl. Schneemelcher, 2,351.

war. So ist bei Ael. *NA* 3,19 überliefert, daß man der Robbe den bösen Blick zuschrieb.[41] Daher konnte man die magische Kraft, die von ihr ausging, auch in apotropäischer Weise nutzen.[42] Plin. *nat.* 2,146, schreibt, daß manche Leute vor einem Gewitter Schutz in Zelten aus Seehundfell suchten, da, wie sie glaubten, die Robbe – neben dem Adler – das einzige Lebewesen sei, das niemals vom Blitz getroffen werde. Auch Plut. *quaest. conv.* 664C; 687C, bestätigt die blitzabwehrende Kraft des Robbenfells. Seeleute bedeckten die Segel ihrer Schiffe mit Robbenfellen, um gegen Blitzschlag geschützt zu sein.[43] Selbst Augustus soll stets ein Robbenfell bei sich gehabt haben, um sich gegen Blitzschlag zu schützen (vgl. Suet. Aug. 90). Vor diesem Hintergrund könnte es durchaus die Absicht des Verfassers gewesen sein, durch den Tod der Robben vermittelst des Blitzschlags bzw. des blitzartigen Sprungs der Thekla die Allmacht des christlichen Gottes zu demonstrieren, der selbst Tiere, die nach dem paganen Aberglauben vor dem Blitz eigentlich gefeit sein sollten, mit einem Blitz töten konnte, um so den Sieg des Christentums über den heidnischen Irrglauben deutlich zu machen.

Schlußfolgerungen

Der Verfasser der Thekla-Akten hat also für ihre Hinrichtung im Theater Antiochiens das gesamte Tierpersonal des Zirkus aufgeboten und als besonderen Höhepunkt der Erzählung für den Leser den Kampf mit den Meeresungeheuern, das heißt mit den Robben. Von den Robben wußte er selbst aber anscheinend nur, daß sie zu den wilden Tieren gehörten, die im Zirkus im Kampf auftreten konnten – genauer gesagt im Kampf gegen die Bären – und sie waren ihm vielleicht aus Homer als κῆτη, das heißt als unheimliche, stinkende Meeresungeheuer, bekannt. Der Begriff κῆτος war dabei auch für ihn als Christen eindeutig negativ besetzt und konnte an die Meeresungeheuer aus der Septuaginta wie Leviatan (vgl. *Ijob* 3,8 τὸ μέγα κῆτος) oder den Wal, der Jona verschlang (vgl. *Jona* 2,1; *Mt* 12,40), erinnern. Entsprechend stellte der Verfasser der Thekla-Akten die Robben

---

[41] Vgl. Detienne/Vernant, 265.

[42] Vgl. Detienne/Vernant, 265: „So the seal, or even the smallest part of one can serve as an amulet whose protective powers are all the more dependable because of the very great power of the evil eye which the seal possesses."

[43] Zu weiteren magischen Praktiken der Antike, die man mit Robben verband vgl. Detienne/Vernant, 265f.

als wilde Bestien („human-attacking seals")[44] dar, die einen Menschen, der ihnen schutzlos ausgeliefert ist, sofort zerreißen und auffressen. Dies zeigt im Verlauf der Erzählung auch ganz deutlich die Reaktion des zuschauenden und mitfühlenden weiblichen Publikums, das Thekla beschwört, nicht in das Becken mit den gefährlichen Tieren zu springen.[45] Nicht zuletzt bot dem Verfasser der Thekla-Geschichte das Wasserbecken der Robben die Möglichkeit, die spektakuläre Selbsttaufe der Thekla zu inszenieren. Außerdem wurde Thekla durch die Einführung der Meeresungeheuer in eine Reihe mit so berühmten mythologischen Exempla wie Hesione und Andromeda gestellt. Homerkenntnis, die zirkusüblichen Bären- und Robbenkämpfe, der Hesione/Andromeda-Mythos sowie das Motiv der Taufe haben in der Thekla-Geschichte offenbar zusammengewirkt.

Dazu paßt auch das, was wir über den Verfasser der Thekla-Akten aus Tert. *bapt.* 17 wissen. Es handelte sich wohl um einen Presbyter aus Kleinasien, der als frommer, aber zunächst anonym bleibender Hagiograph in Erscheinung trat und von seinem Amt zurücktreten mußte, als bekannt wurde, daß er die Paulusakten aus Liebe zu dem großen Apostel verfaßt hatte.[46] Auch bei der Geschichte von der Taufe des Löwen in den Paulusakten

---

[44] Vgl. die Paraphrase von Aymer, 48: „Finally she baptizes herself in a pool of human-attacking seals, and she emerges invulnerable to attack in a ball of flame."

[45] Die Frauen in Antiochien kritisierten bereits das ungerechte Urteil, das Alexandros gegen Thekla erwirkte. Sie zeigen Anteilnahme und Sympathie für Thekla in der ganzen Episode; vgl. *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 27-35. Solche Kommentare eines anonymen Publikums – wie in desem Fall der Frauen und Mütter Antiochiens – kommen bereits im homerischen Epos vor, dort meist in der Form von sogenannten τις-Reden („Und so sprach mancher . . ."). Es handelt sich um ein in der antiken Literatur weit verbreitetes Darstellungsmittel, mit dem hier ein dramatischer Effekt erzielt wird: Erhöhung der Spannung durch Retardation, Steigerung des Pathos; vgl. H. Schneider, *Der anonyme Publikumskommentar in Ilias und Odyssee*, Münster 1996.

[46] Vgl. Tert. *bapt.* 17,4f (CCL 1,291f): *4. Petulantia autem mulieris, quae usurpavit docere utique non etiam tinguendi ius sibi rapiet, nisi si quae novae bestiae venerint similes pristinae, ut quemadmodum illa baptismum auferebat, ita aliqua per se [eum] conferat! 5. Quodsi quae Acta Pauli quae perperam scripta sunt [exemplum Theclae] ad licentiam mulierum docendi tinguendique defendunt, sciant in Asia presbyterum qui eam scripturam construxit quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans convictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse loco decessisse. Quam enim fidei proximum videtur, ut is docendi et tinguendi daret feminae potestatem qui nec discere quidem constanter mulieri permisit? Taceant, inquit, et domi viros suos consulant!* Ob tatsächlich hier Thekla gemeint ist, ist allerdings – wie die Athetese im Text zeigt – in der Forschung umstritten; jedenfalls scheint die Überlieferung des „Quodsi"-Satzes gestört zu sein; vgl. Schneemelcher, 2,195; A. Hillhorst, Tertullian on the Acts of Paul, in: *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla* (hrsg.v. J. N. Bremmer), 150-163.

bewies er große Phantasie.[47] Die grausamen Zirkusspiele kannte er wahrscheinlich nur vom Hörensagen oder aus der Literatur. Proteusgeschichte und Hesione/Andromeda-Mythos konnte er in der Schule kennengelernt haben. Tatsächlich hatte er wohl nie Robben aus eigener Anschauung beobachtet.

Ruhr-Universität
Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät
Institut „Fontes Christiani"
Universitätstrasse 150
D-44780 Bochum

[47] Vgl. *PHeid 4f* (Paulus begegnet in Ephesus dem getauften Löwen in der Arena); siehe dazu Schneemelcher, 2,212f; 230 (dt. Übersetzung von *PHeid 4f*); 242 (die Geschichte von der Taufe des Löwen: dt. Übersetzung aus dem Koptischen).

PATRONAGE, PASTORAL CARE AND THE ROLE OF THE BISHOP AT ANTIOCH*

BY

WENDY MAYER

The connection between patronage, the episcopal role, and the provision of pastoral care in late antiquity has been little explored in relation to the city of Antioch.[1] This omission is perhaps surprising given the large body of evidence available to us in the writings, letters and homilies of John Chrysostom and of Severus of Antioch, and the prominent role of that city in the ecclesiastical and secular politics of the mid fourth to early sixth centuries. In an attempt to redress this deficiency in part, in this paper we examine the topic of patronage and pastoral care in relation to the first of these two corpora with a focus on the ministry at Antioch of John Chrysostom. In so doing we attempt to tease out an understanding of John's actions as a presbyter in relation to the episcopal role.

Before we turn to Antioch, it is first necessary to undertake a brief excursus on the nature of pastoral care in late antiquity.[2] We are obliged to do

* Thanks are due to Pauline Allen, whose Australian Research Council-funded project ("John Chrysostom and Severus of Antioch as bishops, preachers and letter writers: Pastoral care and civic administration in Late Antique culture") suggested the subject of this paper; and to the Australian Research Council whose generous and continuous funding supports the research presented here.

[1] For the few works to date which focus on the city of Antioch and pastoral care see P. Rentinck, *La cura pastorale in Antiochia nel IV secolo*, Analecta Gregoriana 178 (Rome 1970) and A. Natali, Eglise et évergétisme à Antioche à la fin du IVe siècle d'après Jean Chrysostome, *Studia Patristica* 17.3 (1982) 1176-1184, which expands material briefly explored in an earlier article (*id.*, Christianisme et cité à Antioche à la fin du IVe siècle d'après Jean Chrysostome, in C. Kannengiesser [ed.], *Jean Chrysostome et Augustin.* Actes du colloque de Chantilly 22-24 Septembre 1974, Théologie historique 35 [Paris, 1975] 41-59). R. Darling, *The Patriarchate of Severus of Antioch, 512-518*, unpub. doctoral diss., University of Chicago (Illinois 1982) 159-79 looks at limited aspects in relation to the patriarchate of Severus. The author of the first defines pastoral care very narrowly and largely from a mid-twentieth-century perspective, while none discusses the role of secular patronage in relation to Christian philanthropy or euergetism at any length.

[2] The following discussion of the *status quaestionis* with regard to pastoral care in late

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

this because there is no accepted definition of pastoral care for this period, particularly in relation to the East.[3] The topic per se has been little explored, except from the point of view of aspects of social welfare[4] or conversion[5]

---

antiquity closely follows that outlined recently by P. Allen, Severus of Antioch and pastoral care, in P. Allen, W. Mayer and L. Cross (eds), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church* 2 (Brisbane 1999) 391, formulated on the basis of research jointly carried out between the author and myself and used here with permission. The five aspects outlined in that article have since been expanded into the seven which are mentioned here.

[3] By contrast a large number of studies which touch upon the issue have been published for the West. For representative examples see H.G.J. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France During the Sixth Century*, Analecta Gregoriana 51 (Rome 1950); V. Monachino, *La cura pastorale a Milano, Cartagine e Roma nel secolo IV*, Analecta Gregoriana 41 (Rome 1947); *id.*, *S. Ambrogio e la cura pastorale a Milano nel secolo IV* (Milan 1973); and nn.4-7 below. For a rare study which touches upon the topic in relation to the East (Basil of Caesarea) see P. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 20 (Berkeley 1994) 133-89. In all of these works the term itself receives only occasional mention and where it does appear it is used in a general sense, without careful definition.

[4] See in particular Peter Brown's exposition of the connection between social welfare and the rise of the bishop in P. Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity. Towards a Christian Empire* (Wisconsin 1992) Ch. 3, esp. 89-103. For studies of specific aspects of social welfare see, e.g., J. Herrin, Ideals of charity, realities of welfare: The philanthropic activity of the Byzantine Church, in R. Morris (ed.), *Church and People in Byzantium* (Birmingham 1990) 151-164; and E.A. Hanawalt and C. Linderberg (eds), *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judaeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare* (Missouri 1994). For studies of social welfare in relation to specific bishops see, e.g., E. Bellini, L'opera sociale di Teodoreto di Ciro alla luce del suo epistolario, *Augustinianum* 17 (1977) 227-236; and Darling, *Patriarchate*, 159-79. For studies of specific aspects of social welfare in relation to John Chrysostom see F. Sabatini, L'opera sociale di S. Giovanni Crisostomo, in *XPYCOCTOMIKA. Studi e ricerche intorno a s. Giovanni Crisostomo a cura del comitato per il xv° centenario della sua morte* (Rome 1908) 61-79; A. Sifoniou, Les fondements juridiques de l'aumône et de la charité chez Jean Chrysostome, *Revue de Droit Canonique* 14 (1964) 241-69; A. Monaci Castagno, Paideia classica ed esercizio pastorale nel IV secolo: il concetto di synesis nell'opera di Giovanni Crisostomo, *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 26 (1990) 429-59; and B. Leyerle, John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money, *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994) 29-47.

[5] Studies of the processes of conversion are numerous. For some of the more significant see P. Brown, Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy, *Journal of Roman Studies* [hereafter *JRS*] 51 (1961) 1-11; R. MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (New Haven 1984); A. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire. The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley 1991); P. Brown, *Authority and the Sacred. Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman World* (Cambridge 1995). For an outline of the main trends in recent discussion on the topic see M.R. Salzman, Aristocractic Women: Conductors of Christianity in the Fourth Century, *Helios* 16 (1989) 207-20; R. Lizzi, Ambrose's Contemporaries and the Christianization of Northern Italy, *JRS* 80 (1990) 156-73; R. MacMullen,

and the occasional essay on topics such as the role of individual bishops in the destruction of pagan temples[6] or the ransom of captives.[7] Moreover, the twentieth century concept, which embraces a wide-ranging but often specialist activity, influenced to a large degree by trends in modern psychology, probably bears little resemblance to the notion in late antiquity. Added to the difficulty is the fact that although in the first centuries of the church pastoral care may be viewed as confined to the interaction which takes place between the individual, the Christian community and the tradition which shapes that community, from Constantine onwards other factors come into play,[8] such as the cultural context of the bishop in a large Hellenized city, the increased christianisation of classical notions of *philanthropia*, which results in the philanthropic activities of church and state becoming more and more intertwined, and the rapid development of liturgical practices, which, for example, allowed for the greater participation by clergy in such community events as marriage, death and burial. In consequence, in our own recent investigations into the topic, Pauline Allen and I have attempted not so much to define pastoral care in late antiquity as to use various categories under which to consider the phenomenon. These categories are fluid and often themselves intertwined, but they at least allow for a broader view of the issue. They are: teaching (i.e., preaching, catechesis and private instruction); direction for daily life (e.g., counseling, confession); mission (the conversion of both "pagans" and heretics, and the maintenance of orthodoxy); administration (e.g., the *audientia episcopalis*); intercession (e.g., prayer, the ransom of captives); the application of ritualised forms of care (e.g., penance, baptism); and, most familiarly, social welfare.

In regard to Antioch, it is at present an inescapable fact that, aside from

---

Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to Eighth Centuries (New Haven 1997); C. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity. Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore 1997) 181-214 and P. Rousseau, The Preacher's Audience: A more optimistic view, in T. Hillard, R.A. Kearsley, C.E.V. Nixon and A. Nobbs (eds), *Ancient History in a Modern University* 2 (Grand Rapids-Cambridge 1998) 391-400.

[6] See the classic G. Fowden, Bishops and Temples in the eastern Roman Empire A.D. 320-435, *JThS* NS 29 (1978) 53-78; Haas, *Alexandria*, 206-14; and most recently, K. Hay, Homage and Accommodation: The Alliances and Strategies of an Early Bishop, in *Prayer and Spirituality* 2 (see n. 2) (on Porphyrius of Gaza and the Marneion).

[7] See W. Klingshirn, Charity and Power: Caesarius of Arles and the Ransoming of Captives in Sub-Roman Gaul, *JRS* 75 (1985) 183-203; and Brown, *Power and Persuasion*, 96.

[8] See the analysis of C. Gerkin, *An Introduction to Pastoral Care* (Nashville 1997) 23-37.

the role of preacher which he assumed upon his ordination as presbyter, we know very little about the details of the seventeen or so years (c. 381-397) that John Chrysostom spent as a member of the clergy of that city.[9] While it is currently assumed that during his presbyterate (386-397) he rapidly became Flavian's favorite and increasingly took over more than just preaching duties in Antioch's episcopal church (i.e., the Great or Golden Church),[10] scholars have yet to produce satisfactory evidence to support these conclusions. In particular, we know almost nothing about the administrative and pastoral role that he played in the Antiochene church, whether the extra-liturgical duties in which he was engaged differed when his status changed from deacon to presbyter and whether the tasks which he performed as a presbyter did indeed differ substantially from those undertaken by other clergy of the same rank. This latter question is particularly significant if, as has been speculated, John gradually assumed a *de facto* episcopal role as Flavian became more and more elderly.[11]

By contrast, the silence in the sources that causes us such difficulty in relation to Antioch is somewhat alleviated when it comes to assessing the pastoral activities in which John was engaged during his episcopate. While it would be incorrect to claim that there is an abundance of evidence, there is sufficient to determine that John's understanding of the role of bishop and his engagement with the imperial court and with the élite members of the local society were in many respects little different from those

---

[9] The *Dialogue* of Palladius, the *Vita* of Ps. Martyrius and the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret all skim over the years at Antioch and concentrate on the period of John's episcopate. John's own treatises provide only a small amount of information about these years, while the attribution of the majority of his sermons to Antioch is currently subject to revision.

[10] J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth. The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (London 1995) 57. Kelly extrapolates here from earlier conclusions regarding John's alleged special preaching status at Antioch. See F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts*, OCA 187 (Rome 1970) 13-15; and R. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (Berkeley 1983) 13. Baur does not explicitly hold Kelly's view, but does admit that it was likely that John would have become Flavian's successor, and that he was "the most distinguished and most beloved preacher and priest in Antioch" (C. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1 [Eng. trans., Westminster, Maryland 1959] 394).

[11] M. von Bonsdorff, *Zur Predigttätigkeit des Johannes Chrysostomus, biographisch-chronologische Studien über seine Homilienserien zu neutestamentlichen Büchern* (Helsinki 1922) 69 (who follows A. Puech, *S. Jean Chrysostome et les moeurs de son temps* [Paris 1891] 34); Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 103.

of other bishops of late antiquity. At Constantinople he embraced the patronage of wealthy aristocratic individuals, particularly widows[12] and initially persuaded the imperial family, most notably the empress, to offer material and personal support for his efforts to reinforce Nicene Christianity.[13] In the manner of other late antique bishops he reorganized and promoted the hospitals and hospices of the city,[14] even going so far as to emulate Basil in his attempt to set up a suburban institution for lepers;[15] he sold church assets,[16] presumably using the money for philanthropic purposes; he organized the destruction of a cluster of pagan temples in a mission territory;[17] and even in exile undertook to ransom captives and to restore them to their families.[18] In this latter case, like other bishops before and after him, he used the donations of wealthy supporters for the purpose.[19] In short, after his consecration as bishop not only do we observe John swiftly engaging in the same kinds of activities as many of his peers, but we see him rapidly becoming immersed in a system of patronage in which select élite men and women favorable to his activities play key roles and which is vital to the effective administration of his pastoral programs.

When brought together with the assumptions concerning his years among the clergy of Antioch, this picture of John's episcopate introduces a dilemma. The impression given in much of the current literature is that John's experiences at Constantinople were exceptional and that he was ill-equipped

---

[12] Regarding his relations with aristocratic women see W. Mayer, Constantinopolitan Women in Chrysostom's Circle, *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (1999) 265-88. For evidence of his encouragement of the patronage of individual aristocratic men see *Epp.* 51 (PG 52,636-37); 122 (PG 52,676); 217 (PG 52,730-31). Regarding the status of the recipients see R. Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil» de Jean Chrysostome, études de chronologie et de prosopographie, *Recherches Augustiniennes* 25 (1991) 124, 140-41, 169-71.

[13] See Soz., HE 8.4 (John persuades the emperor to deny the demands of Gainas for an urban church for the Arian Goths); *Hom. dicta postquam reliquiae martyrum* (CPG 4441.1), *Hom. dicta praesente imperatore* (CPG 4441.2) (Eudoxia participates prominently in the transferal of martyrs' remains, Arcadius participates on the second day); Soc., HE 6.8, Soz., HE 8.8 (involvement of empress and her staff in financing and staging of counter-Arian processions).

[14] Palladius, *Dial.* 5 (SC 341,122 128-39).

[15] Ps. Martyrius, *Vita Ioh. Chrys.*, Paris Gr. 1519, ff. 491b-495b, 499a-b.

[16] Synod of the Oak, John the deacon, Charges 3-4 and 16 (SC 342,102 19-22; 104 37-9).

[17] Theod., HE 5.29.

[18] Soz., HE 8.27 (GCS NF 4,388 18-19).

[19] Regarding the activities of Ambrose, Caesarius of Arles and others in this respect see Brown, *Power and Persuasion*, 96 and n.132; Klingshirn, Charity and Power, 184-7.

to deal with them.[20] Implicit in the various arguments in particular is the notion that the elevated circles which he entered upon his arrival at Constantinople were markedly different from the arena in which he had operated as a presbyter in Antioch. Yet if John genuinely acted in a *de facto* way as bishop in his latter years at Antioch, then we ought to suppose that he was already familiar with the kinds of circles in which he found himself at Constantinople. The only way in which it is possible to reconcile the two views without being obliged to draw this conclusion is to assume that the episcopal style of both Meletius and Flavian, the two bishops under whom John served and who were therefore his role models, was markedly different from that of their contemporaries. For instance, one might picture them as devoted to asceticism, uninterested in ecclesiastical, local and imperial politics, and generally distanced from the day-to-day running of the Antiochene episcopate. Yet the fact that Meletius was much involved in the promotion of Nicene orthodoxy both at home and abroad speaks against this,[21] as does the fact that Flavian, like Meletius, was well aware of the importance of territorial appropriation and visual propaganda in the struggle at Antioch between the different Christian factions. This is demonstrated by the fact that he instigated the strategic and undoubtedly expensive rearrangement of the burials in a local martyrium in order to highlight the tombs of his own adherents and downplay those of individuals whom he labeled "heretics".[22] It is precisely the same kind

---

[20] The comments of J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops. Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (Oxford 1990) 170 and Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 118, for instance, betray a degree of surprise that John displayed a talent and interest in administration and the handling of finances. This surprise can be traced to an underlying belief that John's ascetic background guaranteed that he was detached from politics and business (cf. Liebeschuetz, *ibid.*, 166: "a man of action, if perhaps in an unworldly way"). This belief is in turn informed by a restricted understanding of ascetic life, particularly in relation to fourth-century Antioch. For the argument that the standard depiction of ascetic life at Antioch and Constantinople in Chrysostom's time is false see W. Mayer, Monasticism at Antioch and Constantinople in the Late Fourth Century. A case of exclusivity or diversity?, in P. Allen, R. Canning and L. Cross with B.J. Caiger (eds), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church* 1 (Brisbane 1998) 275-88.

[21] Regarding Meletius' involvement in the construction and strategic siting of the Church of St Babylas at Antioch and the manner in which he made provision for his own tomb along with that of Babylas see W. Mayer and P. Allen, *John Chrysostom* (London 2000) 18-19. Meletius presided over the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381 in the absence of the Bishop of Alexandria.

[22] See *In ascensionem* (PG 50,443 9-39) on Flavian's recent reconfiguration of the martyrium in the second cemetery at Romanesia.

of strategy which John adopts when he introduces hymn-singing processions at night in the streets of Constantinople in order to reinforce the Nicene message and to counter the influence of the Arians.[23] Moreover, Flavian was the son of a wealthy aristocratic Antiochene family and therefore had at his disposal established links with the élite members of Antiochene society.[24]

Arguments about John's attitude towards women follow much the same lines and introduce some of the same difficulties. Rudolf Brändle is not atypical when he proposes that John was most vehement in his strictures against women in his Antiochene homilies, but that he modified his point of view at Constantinople, where a number of women, Olympias in particular, became important to him.[25] These élite Constantinopolitan women were vital to John's welfare programmes.[26] Again the implication is that John did not have much to do with élite women at Antioch at either a pastoral or social level and that his experiences at Constantinople were exceptional. Yet there is evidence that John had long-standing connections with a number of upper-echelon women at Antioch that survived into at least the middle period of his exile.[27] The relationship with one of them, Carteria, in that she sends John medication and what is possibly a monetary gift and he in turn is unusually careful in his rejection of the latter, exhibits at least some of the same characteristics as his relationship with Olympias.[28]

So far, none of this tells us much about the role of the élite in the pastoral work of the church at Antioch, other than that Flavian was himself a member of the élite and was therefore in a position to exploit his position in such circles.[29] Nor does it tell us much about the role of the

---

[23] Soc., HE 6.8 (GCS NF 1,325-26); Soz., HE 8.8 (GCS NF 4,360-61). Socrates posits an Antiochene origin for antiphonal singing of the kind employed in these processions which suggests that John may in this instance have drawn upon tactics that were already familiar to him.

[24] Regarding Flavian's background see *Sermo 1 in Gen.* (PG 54,585 47-67).

[25] R. Brändle, Johannes Chrysostomus, RAC 18 (1997) 474.

[26] See Mayer, Constantinopolitan Women (n. 12).

[27] See R. Delmaire, Jean Chrysostome et ses 'amis' d'après le nouveau classement de sa Correspondance, *Studia Patristica* 33 (1997) 308-9 and 313 ("E. Laïcs de Syrie").

[28] *Epp.* 34 (PG 52,629 5-15 a.i.); 232 (PG 52,738-39). Cf. *Epp. ad Olymp.* 17 [4] (SC 13bis,370); 15 [15] (358 46-359 53); and the financial support which Olympias is said to have continued into the period of John's exile (Soz., HE 8.27; GCS NF 4,388 17-18).

[29] It is quite likely that, rather than paying for the rearrangement of the Romanesian martyrium out of church funds, he had persuaded wealthy lay Christians to finance the enterprise.

Antiochene clergy, in particular that of John, except in so far as it is clear that during his years in that city John had moved in circles which brought him into contact with a few women of comparable status to that of the women with whom he was most closely associated at Constantinople. Bassiana, for instance, if she is indeed the sister of Aristaenetus (urban prefect of Constantinople in 392 and consul in 404) as has been proposed,[30] is not only of elevated status but has intimate connections with the nobility and imperial administration at Constantinople. Can we elicit any further detail? To return to Flavian, we have an additional piece of information regarding the connection at Antioch between élite status, patronage and pastoral care. In *Sermo 1 in Genesim* John tells his audience that Flavian has turned his ancestral home into a lodging for strangers or *xenōn*. The scale on which Flavian provides hospitality for these people is such, John says, that the house could as well be said to belong to the strangers who are its inmates as to its owner.[31] The most likely interpretation of this scenario is that Flavian offered this hospitality not as a result of his episcopal status, which is in this case coincidental, but rather as a personal act of philanthropy by a wealthy private individual. In much the same way we see Olympias and other rich aristocratic widows providing hospitality for the Tall Brothers and other visitors to Constantinople out of their own resources as private acts of benefaction, rather than as a requirement of their role as deaconesses.[32]

At Constantinople we observe another aspect of pastoral care in connection with the élite which can perhaps be paralleled at Antioch. One of the charges leveled against John at the Synod of the Oak was that he had a habit of meeting with women in private without any chaperon present.[33] This suggests either private counseling sessions with women or sessions in which he undertook their private instruction. Technically female deacons were supposed to perform the latter task[34] and yet we find John during

---

[30] PLRE I, 149-50, s.v. Bassiana and 104-5, s.v. Aristaenetus 2. Cf. Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 114.

[31] PG 54,585 47-67.

[32] Palladius, *Dial.* 7 (SC 341,150 90); 17 (348 197-205). Cf. *Vita Olymp.* 14 (SC 13bis,436-38).

[33] John the deacon, Charge 15 (SC 342,104 36-7).

[34] Although the *Constitutiones apostolorum* makes no mention of this duty in relation to the instruction of female catechumens (*Const. ap.* 3.16), it is assumed as normative in relation to the activities of Olympias: *Vita Olymp.* 15 (SC 13bis,440 12-13). The instruction given by John may in any case have involved more detailed scriptural and theological

his years at Constantinople entering Olympias' monastery on a regular basis to instruct Olympias and her intimates. No other male was permitted to enter there and those who received the instruction, moreover, were women of the senatorial class (if we assume that their servants were excluded).[35] In another Constantinopolitan homily John makes it clear that visiting the houses of women, as well as those of the élite and the palace is a normal activity for a bishop.[36] The miraculous episode at Constantinople detailed by Sozomen,[37] in which a semi-Arian woman with a number of servants finds the eucharist turned to stone and runs straight to John to make confession, reinforces the idea that, whether others were present or not, it was normative for John as bishop to instruct and hear the private confession of upper class women. That this habit may have its origins in Antioch is hinted at in a letter to Adolia, where he not only takes a firm tone regarding her recent sufferings but also says that, if she would only come to Cucusus, he would advise her in person.[38] In another letter to a female member of the Antiochene nobility, Chalcidia, he alludes to trials which she has suffered from an early age,[39] an allusion which we find paralleled only in a letter to Olympias.[40] This may again imply a degree of intimacy with Chalcidia's private life which was gained during his years as presbyter through pastoral activities such as private confession and counseling.

Whatever the case may be, John clearly has networks among both male and female members of the aristocracy of Antioch that he has maintained in spite of his six-year absence at Constantinople, and which he can call upon for assistance in his time of exile. Thus we find him writing to Harmatius, whom he describes as a friend and whom he chides for instructing the servants on his property near Cucusus to attend to John's every physical need.[41] Carteria likewise is intent on attending to his physical comforts,[42]

---

teaching delivered at a level beyond that expected of a female deacon. There is also the question of who taught female deacons their catechetical knowledge in the first instance.

[35] *Vita Olymp.* 8 (SC 13bis,422 5-9); 6 (418 17-19). For a more detailed picture of the monastery and John's relationship with its inmates see Mayer, Constantinopolitan Women, 267-9.

[36] *In Acta apost. hom.* 3 (PG 60,41 6-10).

[37] HE 8.5 (GCS NF 4,357-58).

[38] *Ep.* 133 (PG 52,691 8-25 a.i.); Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 103-4.

[39] *Ep.* 105 (PG 52,664 18-24); Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 119.

[40] *Ep. ad Olymp.* 2 [8] (SC 13bis,174 34-44).

[41] *Ep.* 75 (PG 52,649); Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 111-12.

[42] *Epp.* 34 (PG 52,629 5-15 a.i.); 232 (PG 52,738 27-31 a.i.).

while Dioscorus, also a friend and property owner at Antioch, has sent a servant to Caesarea to invite John to use his house at Cucusus and has sent him provisions for the winter.[43] What is of particular interest is the number of clergy from Antioch who both visit John in exile and have intimate connections with many of John's élite Antiochene correspondents.[44] The deacon Theodotus, for instance, is familiar with Carteria's movements as well as being an intimate of Bassiana's household.[45] He is also to be linked to Marcellinus, the brother of Marcianus, members of the Antiochene élite, who themselves may be correspondents of the orator Libanius.[46] Marcellinus and Marcianus are also closely associated with the presbyter Constantius and are caught up in the persecutions at Antioch after Constantius is denied the episcopal throne through the machinations of John's enemies.[47] Constantius himself spends some time with John at Cucusus after it becomes too awkward for him to remain in Antioch.[48] Asyncritia and Chalcidia in turn belong to the same circle as Constantius.[49] From these interrelationships we can see that John is linked to a significant network of clergy and élite at Antioch which he cannot have established simply at the time of his exile. Its existence suggests, rather, a long-standing and intimate connection between John and these individuals which developed over the period of his presbyterate, if not earlier. The most likely way in which his involvement in this network could have developed is through two factors: his own social standing at Antioch through his family and its connections; and his personal involvement in pastoral care.

If there is relatively little concrete evidence, but the little that does exist suggests that there were marked similarities between the situations experienced by John at Antioch and at Constantinople, is there any circumstantial evidence which might lend weight to this conclusion? One part of

---

[43] *Epp. ad Olymp.* 13 [6] (SC 13bis,128 22-36 [John says that many other estate owners have instructed their managers and supervisors likewise]); 14 [9] (218 22-220 25); Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 125.

[44] For an overview of these relationships see Delmaire, Jean Chrysostome et ses 'amis', 304-5 and 308.

[45] *Epp.* 43-44 (PG 52,633-34); Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 165-66 s.v. Theodotus 3.

[46] Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 139 s.v. Marcianus 1.

[47] *Ep.* 65 (PG 52,644).

[48] *Epp.* 114 (PG 52,670 40-3); 224 (PG 52,735); 237-241 (PG 52,741-46); Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 120-21 s.v. Constantius 2.

[49] *Ep.* 76 (PG 52,649). Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 119, identifies τὸν δεσπότην μου τὸν τιμιώτατον πρεσβύτερον (my master, the most honored presbyter), referred to in the opening lines of the letter, as Constantius.

the key lies, perhaps, in the connection between John and the Antiochene presbyter Constantius, and John's level of involvement in mission activities in Phoenicia. Another is to be found in the personal involvement of John's arch-enemies, the bishops Acacius, Antiochus and Severian, in the ordination at Antioch of Porphyrius and in the desperate haste with which they take this action. Why at the time of his exile in mid-404 was John so close to Constantius, when they were separated by so great a distance and presumably John had not seen him since his own departure from the city almost six years earlier? Why was John so heavily and so directly involved in mission work in Phoenicia, when the region was at some distance from Constantinople and technically under the supervision of the Antiochene bishops and the church in Syria?[50] And finally, why was it so important for John's enemies to ensure that Constantius did not succeed to the throne of Antioch?

Constantius' role as a presbyter at Antioch is clearly an unusual one. According to Palladius,[51] it was widely assumed that Constantius would succeed Flavian and indeed upon Flavian's death, which coincidentally occurred at much the same time as John departed Constantinople the second time for exile,[52] John writes a letter to him charging him with the supervision of affairs in Phoenicia, Arabia and Cyprus, and all the churches in the diocese of Oriens,[53] in other words, precisely those territories which might be thought to fall under the supervision of the bishop of Antioch. It is also significant that in this same letter John assumes that Constantius has been adversely affected by John's deposition,[54] since at that point in time Constantius and his associates at Antioch had yet to be persecuted in their own right. It is also clear that for some time Constantius has been involved in the administration of the mission work among the pagans in Phoenicia, a point which John emphasizes, since he is anxious that it not be disrupted.[55] Several points are to be made here. Constantius has been operating for some time in the capacity of Flavian's heir-designate (that is, as is commonly supposed with John, he may well have been acting in a

[50] Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 120, points out that the regions were dependent upon the patriarchate of Antioch until the fifth century.

[51] *Dial.* 16 (SC 341,308 64-8).

[52] See the careful argument put forward by Delmaire, Les «lettres d'exil», 76-9.

[53] *Ep.* 221 (PG 52,732-33).

[54] PG 52,732 1-7 a.i.

[55] PG 52,732 1 a.i.-733 5.

de facto episcopal capacity, or at least taking on roles beyond that of a normal presbyter); he is closely associated with John in the minds of that bishop's enemies; and his work in Phoenicia has until that point presumably been carried out under the authority of his own bishop, Flavian. Yet in the early period of his exile we see John writing a number of letters both to clergy and monks involved in the Phoenician mission and to élite Antiochene and Constantinopolitan men ensuring that the lines of supply to the missionaries remain constant and that the number of workers is kept adequate.[56] Why, at a time when he himself is in great trouble and presumably distracted by his own situation, does John take over the role of episcopal patron of the mission and its directorship, especially a mission that technically has nothing to do with his own episcopate? If we speculate that Constantius took over from John as Flavian's favourite and heir-designate, then it is just possible that John himself had been involved in the securing of funding, workers and supplies for the mission during his years at Antioch. Moreover, if Theodoret is correct in asserting that John secured funding from his circle of élite women at Constantinople for the destruction of pagan temples in Phoenicia,[57] then this proves that John maintained a close interest in the mission during his episcopate. This suspicion and the premise that John had developed powerful networks at Antioch which he maintained throughout his years at Constantinople is further confirmed by the move of Acacius, Antiochus and Severian to forestall the anticipated consecration of Constantius following the death of Flavian by installing with all speed their own candidate.[58] The haste they exhibit would not have been necessary, if it was not the case that John had maintained close ties with Flavian, Constantius and the network of élite patrons and clergy who supported their work at Antioch. Rather, it can be argued that it is precisely because John's enemies feared that his powerbase at Antioch was of such strength that his support there could undo all that they had achieved at Constantinople that they moved so quickly and decisively to undermine and destabilize it. Their actions make little sense, unless we accept that, even before he arrived at Constantinople, John had had considerable experience of networking amongst the élite and had become entrenched in the complex patterns of patronage and pastoral care that operated within a comparably large and influential city.

---

[56] *Epp.* 21 (PG 52,624); 51 (PG 52,636-37).

[57] HE 5.29 (GCS NF 5,329-30).

[58] Palladius, *Dial.* 16 (SC 341,310 90-312 109).

The picture we have assembled is very blurred, but we are at least able to draw some tentative conclusions. Contrary to the impression generally promoted in the literature, John was not unfamiliar with the kinds of circles he entered upon his succession to the episcopal throne of Constantinople. Nor was he unfamiliar with the role of bishop and the duties, pastoral and administrative, which the office as manifested at Constantinople entailed. On the contrary, it now seems clear that at Antioch John was indeed being groomed by Flavian as his successor, just as his fellow-presbyter Constantius succeeded him in this role, after John was summarily removed from the Antiochene see and taken to Constantinople. In the course of this grooming John would have gained at the very least an understanding of the position, at the most experience of at least some of the pastoral duties attached to the episcopal role. Further, during the course of his presbyterate at Antioch John appears to have been closely involved with a number of aristocratic women within Antiochene society, who maintained their links with him during his episcopate at Constantinople and into at least the first part of his exile. Some of these women are active as his patrons and, as in the case of Chalcidia and Adolia, may well have been direct recipients of his pastoral care. If his relations with women of this rank at Constantinople can be taken as a model, then it is likely that some of the wealthy aristocratic women of Antioch actively supported John's bishop Flavian in his pastoral activities. John may have experienced some of this support personally in his *de facto* episcopal role.

These findings open up some interesting questions concerning the division of labour between a bishop and his presbyters in the late fourth-century in an eastern city of Antioch's social complexity and size. For instance, what was the usual role of a deacon or presbyter at this time at Antioch? To what extent could these roles become specialised? To what degree was the involvement of an individual member of the clergy in patronage networks dependent on the pastoral duties he was required to perform? To what extent, on the other hand, was the level of involvement determined by the individual's private social standing? The answer to these questions would do much to improve our understanding of John's life among the clergy of Antioch as well as elucidating further the distinction or lack thereof between the roles of presbyter and bishop at this city in the late fourth century.

Australian Catholic University
P.O. Box 247 *Everton Park* Qld 4053 Australia

ZUR CHRISTLICHEN IMITATIONSTECHNIK IN DER 'VITA SANCTI MARTINI' DES PAULINUS VON PETRICORDIA

VON

THOMAS GÄRTNER

In der zweiten Hälfte des fünften Jahrhunderts entstand die Martinsvita des Paulinus von Petricordia. Stofflich beruht die Dichtung auf der Prosavita des Sulpicius Severus (Bücher I-III), auf den 'Dialogi' desselben Autors (IV und V) und einer von dem Bischof Perpetuus von Tours zusammengestellten Sammlung von Wundern am Grab des heiligen Martin (VI). Da sich Paulinus der klassischen Form des Hexameterepos bedient (ergänzt durch Prosaprologe zum I. und VI. Buch), ist ein Anschluß an Vorbilder aus dem Bereich der vorgängigen lateinischen Dichtung nahezu unvermeidlich. Als besonders typisch für die Imitationstechnik des Paulinus hervorzuheben ist die konsequente Umbiegung von sprachlichen Elementen der lateinischen Profandichtung auf speziell christliche bzw. hagiographische Motive, ein Verfahren, welches den Leser, der diese Anspielungen zur Kenntnis nimmt und sich an die heidnischen Vorbilder des Paulinus erinnert, mit besonderem Nachdruck auf das Neue und Besondere in der Person und in den Taten Martins hinweist. Das Modell des Paulinus bildet gewissermaßen eine Folie, vor der das vom Autor gezeichnete Profil des Heiligen deutlicher hervortritt: Vor dem Hintergrund eines stofflich aus heidnischer Mythologie oder Geschichte stammenden Vorbilds wird um so klarer, welche Aspekte von Martins Wesen und Handeln der Autor im Sinne seiner hagiographischen Wirkungsabsicht als besonders charakteristisch und wesentlich ansieht. Einige Beispiele für diese besondere Vorgehensweise werden im folgenden unter kurzen sachlichen Titeln zusammengestellt und erläutert. Die dabei herangezogenen Vorbilder sind in den meisten Fällen in dem Similienverzeichnis der CSEL-Ausgabe von M. Petschenig (vol. xvi 1, Wien 1888) und in den Stellensammlungen von M. Manitius (ZÖG 37, 1886, 402 ff. und WKlPh 5, 1888, 1135) nicht berücksichtigt. In jüngerer Vergangenheit werden in einer Wiener Dissertation (Elisabeth Grünberg, Studien zur Vita S. Martini des Paulinus von Petricordia, 1990) ausgewählte

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 54, 71-85

Partien des Epos (I 54-139. II 251-334. 480-538. III 260-362) sprachlich und inhaltlich kommentiert.

1. *Die Mantelteilung (Sulp. vita 3, 2)*

Als Martin im Winter einem unbekleideten Armen begegnet, der von allen anderen ignoriert wird, weist er die wärmende Wirkung seines eigenen doppelten Mantels von sich (I 79-83):

Verum haec districti felix sententia voti
Amouet et tamquam cordis dispendia damnat,
Quod sic maluerit trepidae cautella fidei
Adiectam membris duplicato tegmine partem
Concessisse uni quam diuisisse duobus.

80 *Amouet* RPSV: *Amouit* A *et* RPS: om. VA

Aber diese Vorzüge [des wärmenden Mantels] weist sein glückseliger Beschluß, die eigenen Lebensbedürfnisse einzuschränken, von sich und verdammt es wie einen überflüssigen Umweg seines Herzens, daß die Vorsorge seines [allzu] ängstlichen Glaubens es in dieser Weise vorgezogen hat, einem [Menschen] einen Zuwachs für seine Glieder durch eine doppelte Bedeckung zuzugestehen, anstatt diesen [Zuwachs] unter zweien aufzuteilen.

Der Ausdruck in den Versen 79 f. schließt sich an Claud.[1] carm. 8 (paneg.

---

[1] Zur Frage, ob Paulinus von Petricordia Claudian direkt benutzte, vgl. jetzt Cl. Weidmann, W St 104, 1991, 169-171, der zu keinem sicheren Ergebnis kommt: Die einzige bisher nachgewiesene stichhaltige Übereinstimmung zwischen beiden Autoren ist vit. Mart. V 556-558

... spes omnis in illo (sc. *Deo*) *est,*
Qui caelum terramque regit, cui (sc. *Deo*) *militat aër*
Et permansurum seruant elementa fauorem,

V 576 f.

O nimium dilecte deo: te supplice Christus
Iam pronos celso siccauit in aëre nimbos

~ Claud. carm. 7 (paneg. Hon. Aug. III cos.), 96-98

O nimium dilecte (sc. *Honorie*) *deo, cui* (sc. *Honorio*) *fundit ab antris*
Aeolus armatas hiemes, cui militat aether
Et coniurati ueniunt ad classica uenti.

Diese Anspielung läßt sich, wie Weidmann herausarbeitet, auf ein Zitat der Claudianverse carm. 7, 96 a. 97 b. 98 bei Augustin. civ. V 26 oder Oros. hist. adv. pag. VII 35, 21 (abhängig von Augustin) zurückführen (die Versteile 96 b/97 a werden dort wegen der nicht in den christlichen Zusammenhang passenden Nennung des heidnischen Windgotts Aeolus weggelassen).

Weitere Belege zum vorwiegend christlichen Nachleben der Claudianstelle bietet Schumann, Hexameter-Lexikon III 360 (ss. vv. *militat aer* und *militat aether*). Auf der oben

Hon. Aug. IV cos.), 613-618 an, wo die Freilassung eines Sklaven in Verbindung mit dem Rechtsbrauch der *alapa*[2] beschrieben wird:

> ... *deductum Vindice morem*
> *Lex celebrat, famulusque iugo laxatus erili*
> *Ducitur et grato remeat securior ictu.*
> *Tristis condicio pulsata fronte recedit:*
> *In civem rubuere genae, tergoque removit*
> *Verbera permissi felix iniuria voti.*
>
> Das Gesetz begeht feierlich den von 'Vindex' abgeleiteten Brauch, und der [zu befreiende] Sklave wird, vom Joch seines Herrn gelöst, [zum Ort der Zeremonie] geführt und kehrt [von dort] zurück, sorgenfrei durch den für ihn angenehmen Hieb. Die traurige Bedingung [der Sklaverei] weicht durch den Schlag auf seine Stirn von ihm: Seine Backen röteten sich und bekundeten so, daß er zu einem freien Bürger wurde [wörtlich: "röteten sich zum freien Bürger"], und die für ihn glückbringende Mißhandlung [der Hieb], der die Erfüllung seines Wunsches [nach Freilassung] ermöglichte, entfernte die Schläge [der Peitsche] von seinem Rücken.

Für den derart in die Freiheit entlassenen Sklaven geht mit der symbolischen Mißhandlung glücklicherweise ein lange gehegter Wunsch in Erfüllung (*permissi felix iniuria voti*), womit zugleich von seinem Rücken die Schläge entfernt werden (*tergoque removit/ Verbera*), die seine bisherige unterdrückte Stellung repräsentieren. Dagegen weist Martin seinen eigenen Vorteil in der Gestalt des wärmenden Mantels von sich (*haec . . ./Amovet*), und die von ihm frei bestimmte Haltung läuft auf eine freiwillige Beschränkung der eigenen Lebensbedürfnisse hinaus (*districti felix sententia voti*),[4] was vom Autor

---

ausgeschriebenen Stelle der Martinsvita des Paul. Petric. beruht wiederum Coripp. Ioh. I 289

> *Te* (sc. *Deum*) *venti nubesque pavent, tibi militat aër.*

Coripp versteht *militare* wie Paulinus (entgegen Claudian) als einen "Kriegsdienst" für Gott (die Fehldeutung ergibt sich aus einem falschen Bezug von *cui* im Original auf *deo*) und hat ferner als einzige unter den bei Schumann gesammelten Imitationen wie Paulinus *aër* statt *aether*. Außerdem stimmt der metrische Aufbau des Hexameters mit vit. Mart. V 557 überein.

[2] Vgl. Kaser, Römisches Privatrecht I 102 mit Anm. 12 und ThLL I 2, 1480, 10-18 (*alapa in manumissione*).

[3] *iniuria* scheint in diesem juristischen Zusammenhang terminologisch zu sein, vgl. Iustin. nov. 81 praef.: *actus emancipationis, qui olim . . . cum iniuriis et alapis fiebat.*

[4] Elisabeth Grünberg (12) übersetzt "die glückliche Entscheidung über diesen von widerstreitenden Gefühlen begleiteten Wunsch" und erklärt *distringere* im Kommentar (25 f.) derart, "daß Martin zwischen dem Wunsch zu helfen und den zweifellos unangenehmen Folgen dieser Hilfeleistung hin und her 'gerissen' wird: vgl. dazu Vers 71

als "glückselig" (*felix*) gepriesen wird. Der Kontrastbezug auf das Vorbild hebt das hagiographische Bedeutsame scharf hervor: Es geht Martin nicht um die Erfüllung diesseitiger Wünsche, sondern er schränkt sich im Gegenteil freiwillig ein, und das Ergebnis seines Handelns ist nicht irdisches Lebensglück (so ist *felix* bei Claudian zu verstehen), sondern Glückseligkeit im geistlichen Sinne. Die aus der Claudianstelle neugewonnene Wendung wird später von Paulinus noch einmal aufgegriffen und zur Charakterisierung von Martins Lebensstil verwendet (II 87-89):

> *Sic illi adtrito vilissima vestis amictu,*
> *Sic humilis sancti pretiosa modestia cordis,*
> *Sic manet adsiduae felix sententia vitae.*
>
> So besitzt jener einen ganz billigen Mantel aus abgeriebenem Stoff, so eignet ihm demütige kostbare Bescheidenheit in seinem heiligen Herzen, so bleibt der glückselige für die Dauer seines ganzen Lebens gefaßte Vorsatz erhalten.

Ferner wirft das nachgewiesene Vorbild einen Gewinn ab für die Beurteilung der gespaltenen Überlieferung bei Paulinus: Da Claudian das Perfekt *removit* verwendet, liegt es nahe, die entsprechende, in der Martinsvita als Variante überlieferte Tempusform *Amovit* aufzunehmen und die Erwägung des heiligen Martins (*tamquam cordis dispendia damnat,/. . .*) in der Form eines erläuternden Asyndetons (*. . ./Amovit: tamquam . . .*) an das Vorige anzuschließen. Sprachlich ist das Nebeneinander des Praesens *damnat* und des Perfekts *Amovit* ohne Anstoß, vgl. etwa I 67 f. *Praetereunt cuncti, fastiditamque querellam/Despexit misero locupletum insania risu.*

2. *Martin läßt einen Götzenbaum fällen (Sulp. vita 13)*

Daß die pointierte Wendung *Arboris unius densum nemus* (II 263 "ein dichter Hain, der aus einem einzigen Baum besteht"), welche die ἔκφρασις der *pinus*[5] stilistisch zuspitzt, Ov. met. VIII 743 f. imitiert (*Stabat in his* [sc. *lucis*]

Si tegeret, nudandus erat bzw. seine komplizierten Überlegungen [69 f. *Substitit incertus confuso pectore sanctus/Quid faceret*]". Im folgenden polemisiert sie gegen die herkömmliche Deutung von *districtus* als "streng". Grünbergs Interpretation von *distringere* ("hin und her reißen") läßt sich, wie sie selbst eingesteht, durch keine genaue Belegstelle stützen. Andererseits drängt sich die hier gegebene Auslegung von *distringere* im Sinne einer "Beschränkung" so kurz nach I 56 (*sumendorum districtio quanta ciborum*) dem Leser fast zwangsläufig auf und ermöglicht zugleich einen pointierten Kontrastbezug auf *permissi . . . voti* bei Claudian.

[5] Im Zusammenhang (II 262-264):

> *Arcebatque omnem foliorum crate calorem*
> *Arboris unius densum nemus: umbra perennis*
> *Iugem temperiem mentito vere tegebat.*

ingens annoso robore quercus,/ Una nemus), erkannte vor Petschenig (Index auctorum, p. 169 A) bereits Burmann in seiner Note zu Ov. (?) epist. Sapph. 160.[6] Die Bedeutung des ovidischen Vorbilds erschöpft sich jedoch keineswegs in dieser punktuellen Berührung: Die Erzählung vom Frevel des Erysichthon, der eine der Ceres heilige Eiche fällt und dafür von der Göttin mit furchtbarem Hunger bestraft wird, bietet sich aufgrund der Entsprechungen im äußeren Handlungsablauf geradezu an für eine imitatorische Verwertung.[7] Die Heiden stellen sich zunächst dem Ansinnen des heiligen Martin entgegen (II 268-270, vgl. Sulp. vita 13, 2):[8]

Tum vero accensi vecors insania vulgi
Certat dilecto raptim succurrere ligno
Et prohibere pium toto molimine votum.

Darauf wetteifert jedoch der irre Wahnsinn des erzürnten Volkes, dem geliebten Holz eilend zu Hilfe zu kommen und das fromme Vorhaben [des Martin] mit aller Macht zu vereiteln.

Und der aus einem einzigen Baum bestehende dichte Hain hielt die ganze Hitze durch das Geflecht seiner Blätter zurück: Ewiger Schatten bedeckte das fortwährend milde Wetter, wobei die Illusion eines Frühlings erzeugt wurde.

Paulinus spielt hier auf ein Motiv in antiken Schilderungen heiliger Haine an: Der dichte Laubmantel schließt diese Orte derart ab, daß sie allen extremen Witterungseinflüssen (sowohl winterlichen Niederschlägen als auch sommerlicher Hitze) entzogen scheinen. Diese Vorstellung wird mit den Worten *mentito vere* als Illusion entlarvt (vgl. Grünberg 74). Wahrscheinlich schwebt Paulinus speziell Stat. Theb. IV 419-425 vor (der Hain, in dem die Totenbeschwörung des Tiresias stattfindet):

Silva capax aevi validaque incurva senecta,
Aeternum intonsae frontis, stat pervia nullis
Solibus; haud illam brumae minuere, Notusve
Ius habet aut Getica Boreas inpactus ab Ursa.
Subter operta quies, vacuusque silentia servat
Horror et exclusae pallet male lucis imago.
Nec caret umbra deo ...

Die auffällige Junktur *temperiem ... tegebat* (sc. *umbra*), die den Begriff "bedecken" mit einem abstrakten Objekt verbindet, variiert offenbar das statianische *Operta quies*.

[6] Weiteres zur Imitation dieser Ovidpartie bietet R. Jakobi, Der Einfluß Ovids auf den Tragiker Seneca (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, Band 28), Berlin/New York 1988, 109 f. (zu Sen. Oed. 534-536 und 542-544).

[7] Keinen nachweisbaren Niederschlag bei Paulinus findet die von Ovid sicher nicht unbeeinflußte Lucanpartie, die Caesar in einer Erysichthon vergleichbaren Situation zeigt (bell. civ. III 399-452, von Grünberg 68 zu den Vorbildern gerechnet).

[8] Eine zufällige Übereinstimmung zwischen Sulpicius Severus und Ovid tut ein übriges, die Assoziation zu erleichtern: vita 13, 3 *tum unus ex illis* (sc. *ex gentilium turba*) *qui erat audacior ceteris ... inquit* ~ met. VIII 765 f. *aliquisque ex omnibus audet/ Deterrere nefas.*

Ähnlich wendet sich ein Diener gegen das Vorhaben Erysichthons (met. VIII 765 f.):

> *Obstipuere omnes, aliquisque ex omnibus audet*
> *Deterrere nefas saevamque inhibere bipennem.*

In den Wendungen *prohibere pium ... votum* und *Deterrere nefas* wird die Arbeitsweise des Paulinus deutlich: Er hält sich im wesentlichen an den äußeren Ablauf der ovidischen Schilderung, kehrt aber die Bewertung der handelnden Personen in das diametrale Gegenteil um: Bei Ovid frevelt Erysichthon mit seinem Vorhaben, die der Ceres heilige Eiche zu fällen (met. VIII 761 *fecit manus impia vulnus*; in Vers 767 ruft Erysichthon dem widerspenstigen Diener höhnisch zu *mentis ... piae cape praemia*). Dagegen freveln bei Paulinus die heidnischen Widersacher Martins, dessen Absicht ausdrücklich als *pium ... votum* bezeichnet wird. Der Ausdruck *dilecto ... ligno*, der in der versifizierten Vita die verwerfliche Götzenliebe bezeichnet, greift auf met. VIII 755 *dilecta* sc. *arbor* zurück.[9] Die blasphemische Wendung, mit der Erysichthon in diesen Versen (755 f.) sich nicht nur gegen die Eiche selbst, sondern auch gegen ihre Schutzgottheit richtet (*Non dilecta deae solum, sed et ipsa licebit/Sit dea, iam tanget frondente cacumine terram*), hat (mutatis mutandis) ihre Entsprechung bei Paulinus II 265-267, wo der löbliche Missionseifer Martins beschrieben wird, der nicht nur die Fichte, sondern allen Götzendienst ins Grab stoßen will:

> *Hanc etiam pinum templi sociare ruinis*
> *Adgreditur, parili cupiens convolvere busto*
> *Quicquid in errorem miserorum corda trahebat.*
>
> Auch diese Fichte schickt er sich an, den Trümmern des Tempels hinzuzufügen: Er will alles, was die Herzen unglücklicher [Menschen] in Irrglauben riß, in das gleiche Grab stürzen.

Vor dem Hintergrund der ovidischen Episode macht Paulinus seinem Leser unmißverständlich klar, daß in seiner Erzählung der Frevel nicht auf der Seite dessen liegt, der den Baum fällen will, sondern vielmehr bei den widerspenstigen Heiden, die unbelehrbar am Götzendienst festhalten.

---

[9] Gerade in diesen sich aus dem Kontrastbezug auf Ovid ergebenden Details (*pium ... votum* und *dilecta* sc. *arbor*) geht Paulinus über seine Prosavorlage hinaus, wie Grünberg 98 zeigt.

3. *Martin fastet den ganzen Tag*

Daß der Heilige bis zum Abend fastet, wird von Paulinus durch zwei auffällige Formulierungen ausgedrückt: vit. Mart. II 376

Producens tardos sera in ieunia soles

("die langsam fortschreitenden Tage in bis zum Abend währendem Fasten vergehen lassend") und III 421

Ducens contiguos sera in ieiunia soles

("aufeinanderfolgende Tage in bis zum Abend währendem Fasten vergehen lassend"). *ducere* in diesem Zusammenhang ist nicht singulär, vgl. etwa Faust. Rei. serm. 16 (CSEL xxi p. 287, 3-5 Engelbrecht): *nihil prodest longum tota die duxisse ieiunium, si postea ciborum suavitate vel nimietate anima obruatur* (auch vit. Mart. V 651 *Contiguum semper ieiunia ducta per annum*). Dennoch deutet der Plural *soles* (i.q. "Tage") als Objekt von *ducere* auf den Anschluß an ein dichterisches Vorbild hin, welches Paulinus offenbar an beiden Stellen variiert. Vergil bildet den kallimacheischen Ausdruck

. . . ἐμνήσθην δ' ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι
ἡέλιον λέσχῃ (Bentley: ἤλιον [vel ἡέλιον] ἐν λέσχῃ codd.) κατεδύσαμεν . . .

(epigr. 2 Pf. = 34 Gow/ Page = Anth. Pal. VII 80, 2 s.) nach mit den Worten (ecl. 9, 51 f.):

. . . *saepe ego longos*
Cantando puerum memini me condere soles.

Das in Analogie zu dem griechischen κατεδύσαμεν mit höchster dichterischer Kühnheit verwendete *condere* erweist sich bald als erklärungsbedürftig: Servius erklärt *condere* mit den Worten *finire, usque ad occasum ducere*, und *ducere* gerät (ursprünglich wohl als Glossem) in die Vergilüberlieferung. Nach den Apparaten von Ribbeck und Geymonat zu der Eclogenstelle bietet die erste Hand des allgemein in das neunte Jahrhundert datierten "Guelferbytanus Gudianus lat. 2° 70" (g) die Variante *ducere* statt *condere*. Diese Handschrift steht ihrerseits dem spätantiken Vaticanus Palatinus lat. 1631 (P in den Vergilausgaben) nahe, vgl. Ribbeck prolegomena 320-329 und Mynors praef. x sq. Also ist es keineswegs auszuschließen, daß die Variante *ducere* spätantiken Ursprungs ist.

Weiter fällt in den Formulierungen des Paulinus ins Auge, daß an beiden Stellen die gesperrten Junkturen *tardos . . . soles* bzw. *contiguos . . . soles* durch Penthemimeres und Versende betont werden. In der oben aus-

geschriebenen Fassung der Eclogenstelle steht das entsprechende Attribut *longos* am Ende des vorausgehenden Hexameters, doch läßt sich noch in der Spätantike eine Variante nachweisen, die in der Wortstellung den Hexametern des Paulinus entspricht. Ps.-Acro zu Hor. carm. IV 5, 29 (vol. I p. 344, 20 Keller) zitiert ecl. 9, 52 als isolierten Hexameter in der Form:

Cantando longos[10] *memini me condere soles.*

Vielleicht geht sogar schon die Imitation der Eclogen-Partie bei Persius auf eine derartige Variante zurück (5, 41):

Tecum etenim longos memini consumere soles.

Schließlich läßt sich sogar für die Kombination beider Textmerkmale (*longos* vor der Penthemimeres und *ducere* statt *condere*) ein – freilich wesentlich späterer – Textzeuge anführen: Mathaeus Vindocinensis zitiert ecl. 9, 52 in seiner hochmittelalterlichen (Ende des 12. Jh.) Verslehre 'ars versificatoria' in folgender Form (IV 30):

Cantando longos memini me ducere (DGOV: *condere* A) *soles.*

Hier ist die nach Munaris Apparat in einer von fünf Handschriften gebotene Lesart *condere* kaum mehr als die Verbesserung eines Abschreibers, dem ein korrekter Vergiltext vorschwebte. Nach dem oben Ausgeführten muß man mit einer solchen Textform bereits in der Spätantike rechnen. Die Junktur *ducere soles* hat jedenfalls nach den ThLL V 1, 2164, 65 – 2165, 1 gesammelten Belegen für die Verbindung von *ducere* mit einem Zeitbegriff keinerlei Parallele. Offenbar hat Paulinus die auf die bukolische Tätigkeit des Moeris bezügliche Wendung in korrupter Textform vor sich gehabt und zweimal auf die Askese des Heiligen übertragen.

4. *Das Wüten der Dämonen*

In den Versen II 215-217 beschreibt Paulinus das Gebaren eines im Zuge der Nekromantie an die Oberwelt zitierten Dämons:

. . . / Ut per tartareae quaesita silentia noctis
Mugiat insanus fallaci murmure daemon
Adsumens fictum tenui sub imagine vultum.

---

[10] Auf weitere spätantike Überlieferungswirren an dieser Stelle deutet das Zitat bei Agroecius, ars de orthographia (GLK VII p. 117, 23 Keil), wo überliefert ist *Cantando solitum memini me condere soles.*

... damit bei der Befragung der Stille der unterirdischen Nacht ein wahnsinniger Dämon mit trügerischem Grollen brülle und in der Gestalt eines unfaßbaren Geisterbildes ein vorgetäuschtes Gesicht annehme.

Die Formulierung gewinnt der Dichter aus der blasphemischen Äußerung des statianischen Götterhassers Capaneus über den delphischen Apoll (Theb. III 611-615):

... non si ipse cavo sub vertice Cirrhae,
Quisquis is est, timidis famaeque ita visus, Apollo
Mugiat insano penitus seclusus in antro,
Expectare queam, dum pallida virgo tremendas
615 *Nuntiet ambages*[11]...

Der christliche Dichter greift in seiner Kritik an den heidnischen Prophezeiungspraktiken auf die Äußerung eines Gotteslästerers der profanen lateinischen Epik zurück. Die Assoziation zwischen Apoll und einem Dämon wird ihm um so leichter gefallen sein, da er die heidnischen Götter als Erscheinungsformen des Teufels auffaßt (III 204 ff., speziell zu Apoll vgl. 211). Wie bewußt Paulinus die Übertragung des in der Statiuspartie vorliegenden sprachlichen Materials vornahm, zeigt eine Stelle aus dem Schlußbuch, wo es vom Sprechen eines Dämonenbesessenen heißt (VI 101-103):

Quisquamne hunc sensu proprio putet esse locutum,
Qui fatur non nota sibi? de pectoris antro
Mugit et edomitam flectit possessio linguam.

Könnte irgendjemand glauben, daß dieser mit seinem eigenen Verstand gesprochen habe, der doch ihm selbst Unbekanntes redet? Seine Besessenheit brüllt aus der Höhle seiner Brust und bewegt seine bezwungene Zunge.

Mit der erneuten Anspielung auf die Statiusstelle deutet der Dichter die Dämonen als eine Fortsetzung des heidnischen Göttertums, die jedoch nicht in äußeren Heiligtümern, sondern im Inneren des Menschen (*de pectoris antro*) wüten.

---

[11] Im Mittelalter wird dieselbe Statiuspartie zweimal in der 'Ylias' des Joseph von Exeter herangezogen, um eine Orakelkritik aus der Sicht des christlichen Rationalismus des Dichters zum Ausdruck zu bringen: Yl. IV 219 f.

... herent suspensis agmina bellis
Expectatque antri veniam Mars ipse loquacis.

und IV 228 f.

... at non mugit in antro
Quem suus auctorem mundus sonat...

5. *Die heilsame Wirkung von Martins bloßem Anblick*

Gelegentlich begegnet in der Aretalogie des Heiligen das Motiv, daß dieser, um beispielsweise einen Kranken zu heilen, nicht eigentlich etwas tun muß, sondern daß durch seine bloße Gegenwart die Krankheit vertrieben wird, vgl. etwa IV 133-137 (Euanthius bringt einen von einem Schlangenbiß verwundeten Diener zu Martin, nach Sulp. dial. II 2, 4-7):

Ipse herus, inflectens iusto pia dorsa labori,
Pertulit ad veri vestigia sancta patroni,
Non dubitans meritis per tot documenta probatis
Quod praesens posset tactu depellere virus,
Qui veniens morbos solo terrore[12] *fugasset.*

Der fromme Herr selbst krümmte seinen Rücken unter der gerechten Last und trug [den Diener] vor die heiligen Füße des wahrhaften Beschützers: Er zweifelte nicht, da dessen Verdienste durch so viel Proben bestätigt waren, daß dieser, persönlich anwesend, das Gift durch [bloße] Berührung vertreiben könne; denn er habe [schon oft], indem er [nur] kam, Krankheiten durch den bloßen Schrecken [seiner Gegenwart] vertrieben.

Mit den Worten *solo terrore* knüpft Paulinus an ein Motiv profaner Kampfschilderungen an, daß nämlich besonders tüchtige Helden ihre Feinde "durch ihren bloßen Schrecken" besiegen, vgl. Stat. Theb. VII 740-742 (Aristie des Amphiaraus)

Tunc vero ardenti non ulla obsistere temptant
Signa, ruunt solo terrore, et vulnera citra
Mors trepidis ignava venit . . .

und ferner hiernach Claud. carm. 21 (cons. Stil. I), 188 f.

Miramur rapidis hostem succumbere bellis,
Cum solo terrore ruant (*ruat* g Heinsius)*?*[13] . . .

---

[12] Eine Übersteigerung erfährt das Motiv durch die Ausprägung, daß der Heilige persönlich nicht mehr anwesend sein muß, sondern das bloße Aussprechen seines Namen genügt, um die bösen Mächte in die Flucht zu schlagen, vgl. V 253 f. (der Name Martins bringt einen wütend bellenden Hund zum Schweigen, vgl. Sulp. dial. III 3, 6-8)

Quae meritis, Martine, tuis non mitia cedant,
Cum tantam rabiem vel solo nomine vincas?

(vgl. V 246) und V 740-742 (der Name Martins bringt bedrängten Seeleuten die Rettung, vgl. dial. III 14, 1-2)

Videre inmenso iactati turbine nautae,
Dum furit insanae violentior unda procellae,
Quantum vel solo prodesset nomine sanctus.

[13] Weitere Parallelen für das Motiv bietet Jakobi (wie Anm. 6) 14 mit Anm. 34 (zu Sen. Herc. 1002-1009).

Aufgrund dieser Wirkung von Martins bloßer Gegenwart kann es nicht verwundern, daß die Menschen dem Heiligen auf seinen Reisen geradezu entgegenströmen (IV 258-261):

Innumeri passim coeunt, et sexus et aetas
Omnis adest. nudat vacuos cultoribus agros
Gloria tanta viri. minor est iam cura domorum:[14]
Martinum vidisse sat est . . .

Unzählige Menschen kommen von ringsum zusammen, und jegliches Geschlecht und Alter findet sich ein. Der ungeheure Ruhm des Heiligen beraubt die Felder, unbestellt, ihrer Bearbeiter: Die Sorge um die eigenen Häuser wiegt nunmehr geringer: Es genügt, Martin [nur] gesehen zu haben.

Mit der stilistisch zugespitzten Schlußwendung greift Paulinus wieder auf den Motivschatz profaner Kampfpanegyrik zurück. Der Chor im pseudo-senecanischen Hercules Oetaeus beschreibt das Wüten des Siegers über Oechalia folgendermaßen (162-166):

Muros Oechaliae corpore propulit;
Nil obstare valet; vincere quod parat
Iam victum est – quota pars vulnere concidit?
Pro fato potuit vultus iniquior
Et vidisse sat est Herculeas minas.

166 *vidisse . . . herculeas minas* E: *vicisse . . . herculeis minis* A

An die Stelle des furchtbaren Gesichts des Hercules (*vultus iniquior*), der die Feinde reihenweise erlegt, tritt der auf die Volksmassen heilsam wirkende Anblick des christlichen Helden.

6. *Martin rettet die Umstehenden vor einer Schlange, die durch einen Fluß herbeischwimmt (Sulp. dial. III 9, 4)*

V 619-636:

Tranabat dirus propter[15] *vada proxima serpens*
Et vitreas sulcabat aquas. extabat ab undis
Cum cervice caput. findebat pectore summum

[14] In diesen Worten verbirgt sich eine Anspielung auf ein profanes Herrscherenkomion:
. . ./ *Gloria tanta viri. minor est iam cura domorum*
vgl. Mart. IX 79, 3 f. (Anrede an Domitian):
At nunc tantus amor cunctis, Auguste, tuorum est,
Ut sit cuique suae cura secunda domus.

[15] Zum adverbialen Gebrauch von *propter* vgl. Petschenigs Index verborum et locutionum, p. 184 b.

Festinus fluvium. reliquus per caerula tractus
Flectebat vario sinuamina lubrica motu,
Intorquens levis curvata volumina caudae
Et vibrans tremulam meditata in vulnera linguam.
Hunc ubi vix medio Martinus in aequore vidit
Contiguae properum iam iamque accedere terrae,
Compulit his dictis raptim remeare retrorsum
Obstrictum virtute dei vel nomine Christi:
"Nequaquam ad vetitam ulterius contendere ripam
Te iubeo". stetit in medio mala bestia fluctu
Et fractos rigidus torpor conexuit artus
Membraque captivo paulatim haesere natatu,
Donec praecluso praestructi gurgitis aestu
Languida permisso fluitarent colla profundo
Et retro seminecem ferret piger alveus anguem.

622 *reliquus* Petschenig: *reliquos* codd.

Eine furchtbare Schlange durchschwamm in der Nähe den unmittelbar angrenzenden Fluß und zerfurchte das gläserne Wasser. Aus dem Wasser ragte der Kopf mit dem Nacken hervor. Mit der Brust spaltete sie in ihrer schnellen Bewegung die Oberfläche des Flusses. Die Ausdehnung des restlichen Leibs ließ in dem blauen Wasser schlüpfrige Windungen sich in vielfachen Bewegungen biegen, drehte die gekrümmten Biegungen des beweglichen Schwanzes und ließ die zitternde Zunge zucken zum Zweck der Übung verwundender Bisse. Kaum hatte Martin diese Schlange mitten im Wasser erblickt, wie sie sich dem angrenzenden Ufer schon geschwind näherte: Da zwang er sie mit folgenden Worten eilend zurückzuweichen, gebunden durch die Kraft Gottes und den Namen Christi: 'Ich befehle dir, dich keineswegs weiter dem Ufer zu nähern, das ich dir verbiete'. Mitten in der Flut hielt das furchtbare Untier inne, und starre Trägheit band ihre gebrochenen [erschöpften] Glieder, und allmählich verharrten die Teile ihres Körpers, da die Schwimmbewegung unterbunden war. Schließlich trieb ihr schlaffer Hals in dem ihr gestatteten Wasserbereich (da die Fluten des versperrten Sprudels ihr [nach Martins Weisung] verschlossen waren), und verdrossen trug der Fluß die fast tot erscheinende Schlange zurück.

Die Beschreibung des Heranschwimmens der Schlange, die durch die anatomischen Begriffe *pectus* (621) und *reliquus* . . . *tractus* (622) gegliedert wird, greift auf den Eingang der berühmten Laocoonszene zurück (Verg. Aen. II 203-211):

Ecce autem gemini a Tenedo tranquilla per alta
(Horresco referens) immensis orbibus angues
Incumbunt pelago pariterque ad litora tendunt;
Pectora quorum inter fluctus arrecta iubaeque
Sanguineae superant undas, pars cetera[16] *pontum*
Pone legit sinuatque immensa volumine terga.
Fit sonitus spumante salo; iamque arva tenebant
Ardentisque oculos suffecti sanguine et igni
Sibila lambebant linguis vibrantibus ora.

Sobald mit *iam iamque* (627) der Höhepunkt der Szene erreicht ist, weicht Paulinus in charakteristischer Weise von seinem Vorbild ab: Während bei Vergil die Trojaner hilflos fliehen und Laocoon mit seinen Söhnen ihrem grausamen Schicksal überlassen (Aen. II 212 f. *Diffugimus visu exsangues. illi agmine certo/Laocoonta petunt* . . .), weiß der Heilige Rat und rettet durch seinen auf göttliche Autorität gegründeten Machtspruch seine Gefährten; daß man sich solche anwesend zu denken hat, beweist Sulp. dial. III 9, 4 *in qua* [sc. *ripa*] *constiteramus*. Paulinus hat also offenbar außer der motivischen Nähe zwischen der Mirakelepisode und der Laokoonszene (schwimmende Schlangen) auch die übereinstimmende Erzählform (Wir-Erzählung aus dem Munde eines Beteiligten) wahrgenommen und im Sinne seiner hagiographischen Zielsetzung ausgenutzt: Der Heilige wird vor der Folie der vergilischen Binnenerzählung als einflußreicher und machtvoller dargestellt im Vergleich zu dem mythischen Helden, der nichts tun kann als mit den anderen Trojanern die Flucht zu ergreifen.

7. *Martin heilt die an einer Pest erkrankte Hausgemeinschaft des Lycontius (Sulp. dial. III 14, 3-6)*

Die Besonderheit dieser Episode gegenüber den zahllosen anderen Krankenheilungen in der Martinslegende liegt darin, daß es sich hier nicht um einen einzelnen Kranken, sondern um eine recht große Gruppe von Menschen handelt, vgl. vit. Mart. V 796 f. . . . *non unum hominem sanctus, sed protinus omnem/Suffragio medicante domum sanasse probatur*. Die Beschreibung der ansteckenden Krankheit nimmt bei Paulinus die Gestalt einer regelrechten Pestschilderung an, deren Vorbild die ihrerseits auf Thukydides

[16] Die Junktur *pars cetera* im vergilischen Vorbild bestätigt die von Petschenig vorgenommene Herrstellung eines entsprechenden Subjektsbegriffs bei Paulinus (V 622 *reliquus* [*reliquos* codd.] . . . *tractus*).

beruhende Darstellung der athenischen Pest am Ende des lukrezischen Lehrgedichts 'de rerum natura' bildet. Das beiden Partien gemeinsame Motiv des Versagens der Ärzte (V 820 f., vgl. Lucr. VI 1226-1229) hat als Gemeinplatz für sich keine Aussagekraft. Signifikanter ist die Antithese zwischen solchen, die sich um ihre Angehörigen wegen der großen Ansteckungsgefahr nicht zu kümmern wagen, und anderen, die sich durch ihre Pietas die tödliche Krankheit zuziehen (V 812-819):

Ast alii exanimes saltim contingere caros
Officio miseri nimium trepidante timebant,
Ne dispersa graves sererent contagia morbos.
Hos metus obsequio subtraxerat . . ./ . . .
At qui postremis tumulassent membra sepulchris,
Dilati ad similem non longo tempore mortem
Portabant pariles ad limina tristia morbos.

Andere indes fürchteten sich (die Unglücklichen!), ihre toten Angehörigen auch nur zu berühren, und ihre Dienstbereitschaft war über die Maßen ins Wanken gekommen. Sie fürchteten, daß die Ansteckung sich verbreitete und schwere Krankheit verursachte. Diese also hatte die Furcht von ihrer Diensterfüllung zurückgehalten . . . Diejenigen aber, die die Glieder [der Angehörigen] in ihren letzten Ruhestätten begraben hatten, gerieten ohne Verzögerung nach kurzer Zeit in ein ähnliches Sterben: sie trugen die gleiche Krankheit heim zu ihren unglücklichen Häusern.

Ähnlich unterscheidet Lukrez zwei Gruppen (VI 1238-1243):

Nam quicumque suos fugitabant visere ad aegros,
Vitai nimium cupidos mortisque timentis
Poenibat paulo post turpi morte malaque
Desertos, opis expertis incuria mactans.
Qui fuerant autem praesto, contagibus ibant
Atque labore . . .

Gemeinsam ist beiden Fassungen die moralisierende Bewertung der übermäßigen Angst vor einer Ansteckung (V 813 ~ Lucr. VI 1239). Die Versklausel *contagia morbos* (814) stammt in Anbetracht dieser Übereinstimmungen sicher direkt aus Lucr. VI 1235 f. *Quippe etenim nullo cessabant tempore apisci/ Ex aliis alios avidi contagia morbi*, obwohl andere Vorbilder, etwa Sil. XI 13 *foedi contagia morbi*, denkbar wären.[17] Der Dienst, der den Angehörigen bei Paulinus aus Furcht vor Ansteckung versagt wird, ist nicht etwa wie bei Lukrez die Krankenpflege, sondern die Bestattung (vgl. V 812 *exanimes* und 817); somit spielt in die lukrezische Zweiteilung ein anderes Motiv hinein, vgl. Lucr. VI 1278 f.:

[17] Vgl. Schumann, Hex.-Lex. I 434.

Nec mos ille sepulturae remanebat in urbe
Quo prius hic populus semper consuerat humari.

Beweisend für die direkte Abhängigkeit von Lukrez sind schließlich drei Details der phänomenologischen Beschreibung der Krankheit (V 804-808): 804 *crebra et suspiria* ~ Lucr. VI 1186 *Creber spiritus*; 804-806 *fletus/Adsidui et toto penitus de pectoris antro/Extorti gemitus* ~ Lucr. VI 1158 f. *Intolerabilibusque malis erat anxius angor/Assidue comes et gemitu commixta querella*; 807 f. *flamma medullis/Insita succendens stomachum* ~ Lucr. VI 1169 *Flagrabat stomacho flamma ut fornacibus intus*. Die Form der Aufzählung der Symptome entspricht Lucr. VI 1183-1189.

Der Grund, warum sich Paulinus gerade für diese am Ende der Antike nicht unbedingt naheliegende Pestschilderung als Vorbild entschied, dürfte wiederum in seiner hagiographischen Wirkungsabsicht zu suchen sein. Denn im Anschluß an die ἔκφρασις richtet der Dichter den Blick auf die vertrauensvolle Frömmigkeit des Lycontius, mit der sich dieser hilfesuchend an Martin wendet (V 822-825):

Tali igitur dominus confusus clade suorum
Diffisusque suis precibus placare laborat
Suffragio sancti Dominum meritoque patroni,
Adlegans querulam Martino interprete cladem.

Von einer solchen Heimsuchung seiner Angehörigen ist der Herr verwirrt: Er mißtraut seinen eigenen Gebeten, und bemüht sich, Gott durch die Fürsprache und das Verdienst seines heiligen Beschützers [Martin] zu besänftigen: Die Klage über sein Unglück trägt er vor durch Martin als Vermittler.

Damit distanziert sich Paulinus in der Fortführung seiner Handlung auf das schärfste von den für die (heidnische) Götterverehrung verheerenden Folgen der athenischen Seuche, die Lukrez im Anschluß an den Verfall der Bestattungsbräuche wohl nicht ohne Wohlgefallen im Sinne seiner eigenen epikureischen Ablehnung jeglicher *religio* behaglich ausmalt (VI 1272-1277):

Omnia denique sancta deum delubra replerat
Corporibus mors exanimis onerataque passim
Cuncta cadaveribus caelestum templa manebant,
Hospitibus loca quae complerant aedituentes.
Nec iam religio divum nec numina magni
*Pendebantur enim: praesens dolor exsuperabat.**

D-41199 *Mönchengladbach*, Vlodropstr. 32

---

* Die vorliegende Arbeit entstand im Zusammenhang mit einer von der Fritz-Thyssen-Stiftung großzügig geförderten mittellateinischen Forschungsunternehmung.

THE *PASSIO S. TYPASII VETERANI* AS A CATHOLIC CONSTRUCTION OF THE PAST[1]

BY

ALAN DEARN

To establish one's orthodoxy is to own the past. Nowhere is this more clear than in the context of the Catholic-Donatist schism in North Africa from the early fourth century. In the dispute between the parties, as at the Council of Carthage in 411, each arrayed against the other not merely a body of bishops, but also an army of the dead, the martyrs of glorious memory.[2] At stake was the very ownership of the title *Catholicus*. Who were the orthodox church in Africa? The martyrs of the past had a role to play in this conflict. If Catholics or Donatists could establish that the martyrs of the past were their forerunners, then they would establish a pedigree for their group stretching back through the martyrs, to the apostles, to Christ himself.

This paper aims to explore these themes by discussing one piece of North African hagiography, the *Passio Sancti Typasii Veterani*, which describes the martyrdom of the Veteran Typasius at Tigava in Mauretania Caesarensis around AD 300. This little-known text survives in only one manuscript, edited in the *Analecta Bollandiana* of 1890.[3] Until the discovery and publication of this text, Typasius was completely unknown to modern scholarship. He appears in no extant martyrology or liturgical calendar, and is referred to in no other extant literary text. Indeed, since the discovery of the *Passio*, the name of Typasius has been discovered in only one other

---

[1] I would like to thank Prof. Samuel Lieu, Prof. Averil Cameron and Dr. Andrew Gillett for their invaluable comments on this paper.

[2] Note for example the Donatist bishop Dativus' declaration of the continuing presence of his predecessor, the donatist bishop and martyr Marculus in his see: *Item recitauit: 'Datiuus episcopus Nouapetrensis.' Cumque accessisset, idem dixit: 'Mandaui et subscripsi. Et aduersarium non habeo, quia illic est domnus* (sic) *Marculus, cuius sanguinem Deus exiget in die iudicii.*, *Gesta. Coll. Carth.* I, 187, 1.69 (CCSL 149A, 137).

[3] Passiones Tres Martyrum Africanorum: SS. Maximae, Donatillae et Secundae, S. Typasii Veterani et S. Fabii Vexilliferi, *Analecta Bollandiana* 9 (1890) 107-134.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

context, an undated inscription found near Tigava that includes Typasius in a list of otherwise unknown martyrs.[4]

The argument of this paper is that the *Passio Typasii* reflects a Catholic construction of the past. In particular, it will argue that the way in which Typasius is remembered, or more likely, invented,[5] aims to give legitimacy to the spread of monasticism in late fourth- or early fifth-century North Africa by depicting Typasius as a proto-monk.

The story of Typasius' martyrdom is straightforward enough. Typasius was a veteran, recalled to the army under Maximian in response to an uprising of *gentiles*, or natives, known as the Quinquegentiani. On the morning of the battle, Typasius refuses to accept a donative from Maximian's hand, declaring himself to be a soldier of Christ. In the face of the emperor's anger, Typasius declares that if Maximian discharges him to serve Christ, not only will the Quinquegentiani be conquered without a fight, but he will hear within forty days of other victories won by his Tetrarchic colleages. Events transpire as Typasius had predicted, and he is discharged from the army. Returning to his home, he cast aside his weapons and built a *monasterium* in his field, in which he made his abode.

Some years pass. Maximian, having forgotten the victories granted to him by God through Typasius, sent an edict throughout Africa. In it he decreed that all churches were to be destroyed, all codices of scripture burnt, that sacrifices were to be offered by the priests and people, and that all veterans were to be recalled to service. Doubly culpable for refusing to render either sacrifice or military service, Typasius is dragged off from his *monasterium* and made to appear before the *comes* Claudius. Claudius attempts to persuade Typasius to return to the army and to sacrifice. Typasius refuses, saying "nobody returns to battle after victory. I have conquered the world and I have enlisted among the servants of Christ. I soldier for Christ, I am a servant of Christ, and on behalf of Christ, if you want to rage against me, I stand my ground." Since persuasion failed, Claudius attempts coercion, ordering that Typasius be forcibly girded with his military belt and weapons. This also fails, the belt and weapons miraculously falling in pieces from Typasius' body.

Understandably unnerved by this display, *comes* Claudius orders that

---

[4] Y. Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae: Le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IVe au VIIe siècle*, (Rome, 1982) 387-9.

[5] For the doubtful historicity of the work, see D. Woods, A Historical Source of the *Passio Typasii*, *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993) 82-3.

Typasius be returned to prison. Events now move towards their climax. Typasius is taken by Claudius to accompany him on his assizes, and miraculously heals Claudius' groom when he is seized by the devil. After this, Claudius favours Typasius, even giving him tit-bits from his table, until the *praepositus* Doncius and the *decurio* Lucius stir up dissension among the soldiers over Typasius' preferential treatment. Forced to act against his will, Claudius sorrowfully passes sentence against Typasius, and he is beheaded. The *Passio* ends with an account of the fate of Typasius' persecutors. Doncius and Lucius die horribly, their bodies practically dissolving as they stand before Claudius. Even the eventual death of Maximian at the hand of Constantine is explained as punishment for the death of Typasius.

To anyone with even the most cursory familiarity with late antique hagiography, much of the story of Typasius sounds very familiar. It clearly stands in the same tradition as numerous other martyr stories, and particularly those of other military martyrs executed under Diocletian and his colleagues. For example, the African martyr stories of Marcellus the centurion and Maximilian the recruit tell similar stories. In the case of the former, Marcellus is unable to continue serving in the army, and throws down his military belt during the emperor's birthday celebrations.[6] In Maximilian's case, he refuses to receive the *sacramenta*, the symbols and rituals of his recruitment.[7] In both cases the martyr's logic is the same, and the same as that of Typasius. Service in the army of the world is incompatible with the service of God.

However, although the *Passio Typasii* has much in common with some of the North African martyr stories that came before it, it also contains some distinctive features reminiscent of two literary texts in particular: the *Breviarium* of Eutropius and Sulpicius Severus' *Vita Martini*. To begin with, the *Passio* is notable for the degree of historical context it provides for Typasius' discharge from the army and eventual martyrdom. It is very common for North African martyrology to introduce the action of the narrative with nothing more than an ablative absolute construction giving the consuls for the year in which the martyrdom took place. In contrast, the *Passio Typasii* opens with a description of the troubles raging *in temporibus*

---

[6] *Acta Marcelli* 1.1 (BHL 5253), in H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford, 1972) 250-5.

[7] *Acta Maximiliani* 2.4 (BHL 5853), in H. Musurillo, op. cit. 244-9. For the *sacramenta* of military service and its incompatibility with Christian identity, see E.E. Malone, *The Monk and the Martyr*, (Washington, 1950) 112-116.

Diocletiani et Maximiani imperatorum which led to Diocletian promoting Maximian to the rank of Augustus.[8] The list of calamities includes the rebellion of Narses in the east, that of Carausius in Britain, and that of Achilleus in Egypt and Libya, along with the depredations of the *Bacaudae* in Gaul and the *Quinquegentiani* in Africa.

As David Woods has demonstrated,[9] the author of the *Passio Typasii* appears to have used Eutropius as a source for this and other contextual information. Although it is possible that the author of the *Passio* may have used some other lost epitome for his historical information, the verbal similarities with Eutropius are striking. Three sections of the *Passio* in particular appear to borrow from Eutropius, and have been discussed in detail by Woods. The first two of these describe the state of the empire early in the reign of Diocletian and Maximian and the elevation of Maximian to the rank of Augustus,[10] while the third describes the eventual fate of Maximian.[11]

To summarise each in turn, we have already seen that the *Passio* opens with a catalogue of the empire's woes early in Diocletian and Maximian's reign. The specific rebellions or usurpations that are mentioned are identical to those described by Eutropius in chapters 20 and 22 of his *Breviarium*. Indeed, the *Passio* account reads as a paraphrase of these two chapters, using much of the same terminology and lumping the same events together, albeit in a different order. However, as one would expect, the narrative is altered in order to emphasise the depredations of the Quinquegentiani in Mauretania, whereas Eutropius' account had referred baldly to their attack on Africa.[12] In the *Passio*, as in Eutropius' account, the description of the empire's woes culminates in the elevation of Maximian to Augustus. Here also, there are strong verbal similarities between the two accounts,[13] although

---

[8] *Passio Typasii* 1.

[9] D. Woods, A Historical Source of the *Passio Typasii*, *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1993) 78-84. For the Christian use of pagan *breviaria*, see A. Momigliano, Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century AD, in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1963) 86-7.

[10] *Passio Typasii* 1.

[11] *Passio Typasii* 8.

[12] Compare Eutropius' terse *Africam Quinquegentiani infestarent* in *Breviarium* 9.22 (MGH[AA] 2, 162), with the *Praeterea in Sitifensi provincia gentiles, qui semper pacati fuerant et Quinquegentiani uocantur . . . latrocinia perpetrabant* of *Passio Typasii* 1.

[13] Compare Eutrop. *Brev.* 9.22: . . . *Diocletianus Maximianum Herculium ex Caesare fecit Augustum, Constantium et Maximianum Caesares, quorum Constantius per filiam nepos Claudi traditur, Maximianus Galerius in Dacia haud longe a Serdica natus . . .* with *Passio Typasii* 1: *Diocletianus itaque, oppressus tantorum clade bellorum, Maximianum ex Caesare fecit Augustum . . .* See D. Woods, art. cit. (1993) 80.

the *Passio* account omits any reference to the elevation of the Caesars Constantius I and Galerius.

In the account of Maximian's eventual fate, the influence of Eutropius is again clear. Indeed, the description of Fausta reporting Maximian's treachery to Constantine is almost identical.[14] What emerges in the final sections of the *Passio* are the very different interpretations that our author has given to the events drawn from Eutropius, the different meaning that he has given to the past. As Momigliano once pointed out, the neutral tone of the fourth century pagan *breviaria* was ripe for exploitation by Christians writing about the past.[15] For Eutropius, Diocletian arranged his and Maximian's abdication so that the empire could be ruled by younger and more vigorous men. To the author of the *Passio*, Christ brought about their abdication in order to avenge the martyrs, causing them to be afflicted with unease and illness whenever they donned their imperial regalia. To Eutropius, Maximian's death was deserved because of his treachery, and because of his disposition towards harshness and cruelty. For Typasius' hagiographer, Maximian was the *persecutionis princeps*. His death at the hand of Constantine was as punishment for this, and for the vindication of Typasius.

So then, Eutropius provided the author of the *Passio Typasii* with a past in which to locate his hero, but the work gained particular relevance to the late fourth- or fifth-century present from its relationship with the *Vita Martini* of Sulpicius Severus. In seeing parallels between the account of Typasius and that of Martin, some caution is necessary. Neither text represented something wholly new. Both were written in the context of developing Christian discourses about the heroes of the past, and both heroes were conceived as emulating other illustrious predecessors.[16] Nevertheless, a number of close parallels suggest strongly that either Typasius' hagiographer was influenced by the *Vita Martini*, or that Sulpicius Severus was influenced by the *Passio Typasii*. Let us first consider the parallels between the texts before discussing the problem of their relationship.

---

[14] Compare Eutrop. *Brev.* 10.3: *Detectis igitur insidiis per Faustam filiam, quae dolum viro enuntiauerat, profugit Herculius Massiliaeque oppressus (ex ea enim nauigare ad filium praeparabat) poenas dedit iustissimo exitu* with *Passio Typasii* 8: *Sed Maximianus . . . Constantino imperatori genero suo pararet insidias, detectus per Faustam filiam suam, quae dolo marito renuntiauerat, profugit Massiliaeque oppressus, [ea] causa Constantini iussu est peremptus. . . .*

[15] A. Momigliano, op. cit. 86.

[16] For the literary antecedents of the *Vita Martini* (BHL 5610), see C. Stancliffe, *St. Martin and His Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus* (Oxford 1983) 87ff.

Both Typasius and Martin are military figures. The accounts of both lead to a dramatic scene of *conuersio*, in which they leave the army. In both cases however, their hagiographers are at pains to point out the pre-existing sanctity of their subjects. Martin is regarded during his time in the army more as a monk than a soldier. Typasius, before being recalled to the army under Maximian, had scorned the world and surrendered himself utterly to Christian devotion. Both enjoyed good reputations as a result.[17] Both accounts lead up to very similar scenes of confrontation with Typasius' and Martin's supreme commanders, the emperors themselves. The context of each is the distribution of a donative to the troops prior to battle. For Martin, the confrontation occurs under Julian as Caesar, when he had brought together his army to repel barbarians in Gaul, for Typasius, when Maximian has concentrated his army to fight the Quinquegentiani. In both accounts, the climax comes when Typasius and Martin are called forward, and refuse to take the donative. They are soldiers of Christ, and are thus unable to serve.[18]

Although there is considerable similarity between these accounts, so far we are not seeing anything particularly new. The scenes of confrontation with the military commander, leading to the martyr's *confessio* of the incompatibility of Christian and worldly service, are *topoi* of many similar accounts, as in the stories of Marcellus and Maximilian which we have already mentioned. What is more unusual is what happens next. Both the heroes are released from the army when the emperor defeats the enemy without having to face them in battle, the barbarians coming to terms.[19] After their discharge, both take up the ascetic life. Martin, after spending some time with Hilary of Poitiers, made himself a *monasterium* at Milan when he heard that Hilary had been exiled by Constantius II. He goes on to build a *monasterium* near Poitiers, a *cellula* next to the church at Tours, then a *monasterium* about two miles from Tours, in a place so secluded, we are told, that it had all the solitude of the desert.[20] Typasius after leaving the army

---

[17] *Vita Martini* 2, ed. J. Fontaine, *Vie de saint Martin* (Paris, 1967), trans. F.R. Hoare, *The Western Fathers* (London, 1954) 10-44; *Passio Typasii* 2.

[18] Compare *Vita Martini* 4.3: *'Donatiuum tuum pugnaturus accipiat; Christi ego miles sum: pugnare mihi non licet'* with *Passio Typasii* 2 . . . *beatissimus Typasius, aurum de manu Maximiani accipere noluit et se Christi militem dixit.*

[19] *Vita Martini* 4.9; *Passio Typasii* 3.

[20] *Vita Martini* 6.4; 7.1; 10.3-4.

built a *monasterium* in his field, and was still living in it when Maximian's Edict of Persecution was published. He is finally dragged out along with his belt, shield and spears "from the same *cellula*".[21]

The ascetic or monastic life that each take on after their discharge is also reflected in their clothing. Martin is criticised for his appearance and shabby clothing, which he retains even after being made bishop. He was especially in the habit of wearing a garment of camel hair, the hairs of which were thought to have healing powers.[22] When Typasius is brought before Claudius, the *comes* is confused about Typasius' clothing. "Why" he asks the *praepositus* and *decurio*, "have you brought me someone in mourning?"[23]

So in both cases we have the same theme. For Marcellus and Maximilian, their *confessio* led to their martyrdom. For Martin and Typasius, it led to discharge from the army and the taking up of an ascetic lifestyle. Where Martin and Typasius differ is that the *Passio Typasii* contains a second confrontation. Martin lives a life of exemplary *uirtus* as bishop of Tours, Typasius' second *confessio* after his recall to the army results in his martyrdom.

Did either text directly influence the other? It is impossible to answer this question with confidence, given the notorious difficulties of dating a text like the *Passio Typasii*, where our only means of dating are its perceived relationship to other texts and its lexigraphical features. What can we say with some confidence? Firstly, the *Passio*'s apparent reliance on Eutropius gives us a fairly firm *terminus post quem* of AD 369-70.[24] Secondly, Sulpicius Severus most likely published his *Vita Martini* in 396,[25] so the *Passio* was either written between 370 and 396, or was written after 396.

After this we are on less certain ground. Woods has made a valiant attempt to date the composition of the *Passio* to between October 397 and January 399, based on what he sees as echoes of the circumstances of Gildo's revolt in North Africa in the author's description of the Quinquegentiani.[26] Although I share his conclusions as to the approximate date of the *Passio*, I remain unconvinced by his argument. Even if Woods is correct in seeing the impact of the events of the late 390's in the *Passio Typasii*, the best he may

---

[21] *Passio Typasii* 4.

[22] *Vita Martini* 9.3; 10.2; 10.8; 18.4.

[23] *Passio Typasii* 5: '*Quare istum cum ueste lugubri meis oculis ingessistis* (sic)?'.

[24] D. Woods, art. cit. (1993) 81; W. den Boer, *Some Minor Roman Historians* (Leiden, 1972) 114.

[25] C. Stancliffe, op. cit. 71-2.

[26] D. Woods, An Unnoticed Official: The *Praepositus Saltus*, *Classical Quarterly* 44 (i) (1994) 245-251.

hope to achieve is a new *terminus post quem*, not an aid to absolute dating.

The other main hope of dating the text lies in its use of monastic terminology, particularly the use of the term *monasterium*. So far as is known, *monasterium* entered Latin as a loan word from the Greek through Evagrius' translation of the *Vita Antonii* between 357 and 370,[27] being strikingly absent from an earlier anonymous translation of the text.[28] Although the term is found in other Latinate texts from the 380's,[29] it does not appear to have become well known in North Africa until the decade following the foundation of Augustine's monastery at Hippo in 391. This suggests that the *Passio Typasii* was written under the influence of the *Vita Martini*. This impression is strengthened by what we know of the movement of the two texts. We have absolutely no evidence for a cult of Typasius outside Mauretania, or for the transmission of the *Passio*. In contrast, we know that the *Vita Martini* was circulating in Africa by the early fifth century at the latest. Sulpicius was able to claim in the first of his *Dialogues* that his account of Martin was being widely read in Carthage by around AD 400,[30] and Paulinus' *Life of Ambrose*, written in Africa in 422, was consciously emulating Sulpicius' work.[31]

It seems therefore that the *Passio Typasii* followed the *Vita Martini*, which provides a new *terminus post quem* of 396. What of a *terminus ante quem*? There is really no firm evidence that allows us to state unequivocally whether this text dates from the fifth century or even from the sixth. However, two criteria, both far from certain, suggest a date around the beginning of the fifth century. Firstly, the author of the *Passio* used the pagan epitomator Eutropius. As we have seen, this presented no difficulty to a Christian

---

[27] L. Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the Vita Antonii with Reference to Fourth- and Fifth-Century Monastic Literature* (Nijmegen, 1955) 43-9. See also E.A. Judge, The Earliest Use of Monachos for 'Monk' (P. Coll. Youtie 77) and the Origins of Monasticism, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 20 (1977) 79, n. 23.

[28] L. Lorié, op. cit. 43.

[29] For example, see the *Itinerarium Egeriae* (= *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*) ed. O. Prinz (Heidelberg, 1960). For a summary of the arguments in favour of dating Egeria's journey to the early 380's, see J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land* (rev. ed. Jerusalem & Warminster, 1981) 237-9.

[30] Sulp. Sev. *Dialogus 2*, 23: *'Hic nauigationis meae cursum longe ante praegressus, cum ad Africam uenissem, iam per totam Carthaginem legebatur . . .'* (PL 20, 198).

[31] *Vita Ambrosii* 1: *Hortaris, uenerabilis pater Augustine, ut sicut beati uiri Athanasius episcopus et Hieronymus presbyter stylo prosecuti sunt uitas sanctorum Pauli et Antonii in eremo positorum, sicut etiam Martini uenerabilis episcopi Turonensis Ecclesiae Severus seruus Dei luculento sermone contexuit . . .* (BHL 377; PL 14, 27; trans. F.R. Hoare, op. cit. 149-88).

author. However, it is perhaps a moot point whether a North African Christian author would continue to use Eutropius once the work Orosius became available after AD 417.[32] Perhaps more persuasively, although Typasius' *monasterium* has been noted in discussions of the text, and used as an aid for dating, the point has not been made that *monasterium* can mean several different things. In its literal meaning it denotes the place where one lives in solitude, the cell of the anchoritic monk.[33] It is this kind of *monasterium* that Typasius builds in his field, which allows the author of the *Passio* to treat the term as synonymous with *cellula*.[34] However, from the late fourth century the term was increasingly used to denote the habitation of a number of monks, or the ordered community bound by a rule, after the Pachomian model.[35] The word is used with both meanings in Sulpicius' *Vita Martini*. However, the *Passio Typasii* appears to be the only North African text that uses *monasterium* in the sense of a hermitage.[36] Such was the impact of Augustine's model of communal monasticism from 391 that the term *monasterium* in North Africa appears to have lost its original and literal meaning. It is plausible to suggest therefore that the author of the *Passio Typasii* may have written his work under the influence of the *Vita Martini*, but before the impact of Augustine's monasticism was felt throughout Mauretania Caesarensis.

So, in the *Passio Typasii* we are hypothetically dealing with a piece of hagiography contemporary with Augustine. How might we understand this text in the context that produced it? As with the *Vita Martini*, considering the theme of the monastic life taking the place of martyrdom gives a window onto the way the texts may have functioned as influences on particular ideas of Christian identity. The purpose of the *Vita Martini* in particular is clear, since Sulpicius spelled it out. His self-conscious concern was to place Martin within the same tradition as the illustrious martyrs of the past and the eastern monks of the present, depicting his life as one fulfilling the role of martyrdom in the changing world of the fourth century. A world where actual martyrdom, for the orthodox at least, was unlikely to present itself

---

[32] D. Woods, art. cit. (1994) 250, n. 29.

[33] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 1403, 4-42.

[34] *Eodem tempore sanctus Typasius solus in monasterio quod sibi construxerat habitabat. Tunc praepositus saltus atque decurio eum . . . de eadem cellula protraxerunt. . .* (*Passio Typasii* 4).

[35] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 1403, 43-1404, 66.

[36] G. Folliet, Aux origines de l'ascétisme et du cénobitisme Africain, in *Saint Martin et son Temps* (Rome, 1961) 30, n. 25. See also L. Lorié, op. cit. 49.

as an option.[37] Sulpicius was not innovative in making the connection between martyrdom and the ascetic life. However, in presenting the biography of an exemplary Christian hero to a Latinate audience, creating a western counterpart for Athanasius' Antony, he stands at the head of a long and influential tradition.

What of the *Passio Typasii*? What would it have taught its North African audience? One clear message of the *Passio* is that the monastic life and martyrdom are both equally valid responses for the Christian living in the world. Typasius was prepared to face martyrdom before Maximian, but it was not required of him. Instead, he withdrew to the seclusion of his *monasterium*. Only later was he compelled to win the martyr's crown. Consequently, its audience would have learned that what martyrdom had been in the time of the Great Persecution, the monastic life could be in the post-Constantinian world. Not only did the *Passio* give legitimacy to monasticism by portraying it as a continuance of the martyrdom of the past, but it also explicitly gave monasticism legitimacy by reading it back into that past. Typasius dies a martyr, but part of his life is lived as a monk, a lifestyle explained using terminology that would not reach the Latin West for more than sixty years after the close of the Great Persecution.

Therefore, we can see the *Passio Typasii* as a literary product of a changing world, but it was also a product of a world fraught with conflict. The story of Typasius celebrates the victorious life and death of an exemplary Christian hero, but which Christians considered him an exemplar, and built their present identity in reference to his past? I would like to argue that this text is a product of a community of what became the Catholic church, asserting an identity contrary to that of the Donatists.

Several features make this plain. Firstly, the generally pro-imperial tone of the *Passio* makes Donatist authorship unlikely.[38] For Catholics, the imperial government from the late fourth century was generally patron and protector. For Donatists, imperial government represented the tyrannical forces of persecution. In the *Passio* however, the *comes* Claudius is portrayed as a most reasonable man, manipulated into having Typasius executed against his will.[39]

---

[37] For example, see Sulp.Sev. *Ep.* 2: *Nam licet ei ratio temporis non potuerit praestare martyrium, gloria tamen martyris non carebit, quia uoto atque uirtute et potuit esse martyr, et uoluit.* (PL 20, 179).

[38] D. Woods, art. cit. (1994) 249.

[39] *Passio Typasii* 7: *Cumque Claudius comes reluctatus diu fuisset et tumultum militum sustinere non posset, sanctum Typasium perduci iussit e carcere.*

In addition, the author's failure to mention the elevation of Galerius and Constantius to the rank of Caesar in the context of Maximian's elevation to Augustus perhaps reflects a desire to avoid tarnishing the memory of Constantine. Secondly, the scant geographical information contained in the *Passio* also suggest Catholic authorship, with Tigava, the site of Typasius' martyrdom, being a Catholic stronghold by the end of the fourth century.[40]

More significantly, the theme we have been discussing of monastic exemplars supplementing the martyrs of the past reflects a Catholic reality. Some caution is necessary here. Even within what would become the Catholic church, views were not united as to the validity of the new holy men as exemplars, as the experience of Martin of Tours and Sulpicius Severus himself makes plain.[41] However, monasticism was not part of the Donatist reality. Asceticism, on the other hand, most certainly was. Catholics and Donatists in North Africa shared a rich tradition of ascetic life and teaching.[42] But monasticism was a particular expression of the ascetic life, transmitted to the west and popularised by the Catholic *litterati*, containing its own logic, its own exemplars and its own terminology. It served to distinguish legitimate ascetic practices from their competitors, it drew the line between "us" and "them".[43] For example, we see a clear reflection of the Catholic ownership of monasticism in the west in Possidius' *Vita Augustini*. In chapters 10 and 12 of his biography of Augustine, Possidius describes the Donatist *Circumcelliones*. Juxtaposed with his polemic is a description of the monks of Augustine's monastery in chapter 11.[44] Despite the ascetic practices of the *Circumcelliones*, Possidius' point is clear. They are not monks as a Catholic would have understood them. Similarly, Augustine himself in his *Enarratio in Psalmum CXXXII* had contrasted Catholic monks with Donatist *Circumcelliones*, implying that it was possible to confuse the two

---

[40] W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church*, (Oxford, 1952) 51.

[41] C. Stancliffe, op. cit. 82ff.

[42] G. Folliet, op. cit. 25ff.

[43] See E.A. Judge, art. cit. 76.

[44] For example, compare *Habebant etiam iidem Donatistae per suas pene omnes Ecclesias inauditum hominum genus peruersum ac uiolentum, uelut sub professione continentium ambulantes, qui Circumcelliones dicebantur.* (*Vita Augustini*, 10) with Possidius' approval of the manner in which Augustine's monastery began to provide the personnel for the church at Hippo: *Ac deinde innotescente et clarescente de die in diem Ecclesiae catholicae praedicationis ueritate, sanctorumque seruorum Dei proposito, continentia, et paupertate profunda* . . . (*Vita Augustini*, 11). (BHL 785; PL 32, 41-42; trans. F.R. Hoare, op. cit. 204-6).

groups, and making plain that the name *Monachus* was shunned by Donatists as the nomenclature of their opponents.[45]

More clearly still, there is evidence that Augustine himself was seen by his opponents as the originator of the monastic way of life. In his reply to the letters of the Donatist bishop Petilian between 398 and 401, Augustine replies briefly to Petilian's denigration of monasteries and monks.[46] The Donatist bishop had clearly seen the monastic way of life with its attendant terminology as a suspect innovation. In reply, Augustine accuses Petilian of only pretending not to know of it. After all, monks and monasteries are perfectly well known throughout the whole world, an assertion which adds weight to Augustine's claim to be a representative of the *Ecclesia Catholica*.[47] Here again we see that the terminology of monasticism was experienced by its audience in North Africa as ideological and polemical, not descriptive. That is, it claimed a particular model of ascetic life for the Catholic church, and this fact was recognised by its opponents.[48]

Furthermore, martyrdom for Donatists was not simply a remembered part of their past heritage, it remained a present reality. Whereas Catholics needed to find new monastic heroes to continue the heritage of the martyrs, martyrology continued as a dynamic literary genre within Donatist communities. Indeed one account, that of the Abitinian Martyrs, is effectively the foundation text of Donatism. Other accounts continued the memory of the martyrs well beyond Milvian Bridge, adding new ranks of martyrs

---

[45] Aug. *Enarratio in Psalmum CXXXII*, 3: *Ex uoce huius psalmi appellati sunt et Monachi, ne quis uobis de isto nomine insultet Catholicis. Quando uos recte haereticis de Circellionibus insultare coeperitis, ut erubescendo saluentur; illi uobis insultant de monachis.* See also section 6, where Augustine gives an etymology of *monachus* emphasising the idea of unity, in order to set up a polemical counterpoint to the Donatist rejection of unity: *Merito illis displicet nomen monachorum, quia illi nolunt habitare in unum cum fratribus; sed sequentes Donatum, Christum dimiserunt.* (PL 37, 1729-36).

[46] Aug. *C.Litt. Petiliani*, III.40.48: *Deinceps perrexit ore maledico in uituperationem monasteriorum et monachorum, arguens etiam me, quod hoc genus uitae a me fuerit institutum; quod genus uitae omnino quale sit nescit uel potius totō orbe notissimum nescire se fingit.*

[47] Aug. *C.Litt. Petiliani*, II.38.90-1.

[48] For a modern misunderstanding of this use of monastic terminology, see B. Quinot, *C. Litteras Petiliani* III. xl.48 et le monachisme en Afrique, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 13 (1967) 18. Quinot treats monastic terminology as simply describing ascetic practice. Therefore, he is forced to explain why Petilian accuses Augustine of innovation, and reaches the conclusion that it is the type of monasticism founded by Augustine that Petilian objects to, rather than the ideological construction of monasticism itself.

to those that Catholics and Donatists held in common.[49] For example, the *Passio Marculi* records the martyrdom of a Donatist bishop in 347. The account follows the well-established forms of a North African martyr story, but instead of being persecuted by pagan administrators, Marculus is tortured and executed by *traditor*—Catholic—officials. From the point of view of the Donatists, the world had not changed with the conversion of Constantine. They alone were the Catholic church in North Africa, the true church persevering under persecution.[50]

In the ideological battle between Catholics and Donatists, Typasius in death fought on the Catholic side. His story deserves to be more widely known, because here is a text illuminating a changing world, a text that is polemical by its very nature. Typasius is recalled to the standards once again, but this time to do service as a proto-monk. The monk and the martyr meet in the one man, and the Catholic present gains legitimacy from the heroic past.

Macquarie University Sydney, Australia

[49] See M. Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa* (Liverpool, 1996).

[50] For example, the author of the *Passio Marculi* takes pains to assert a continuity between the martyrdom of Marculus and the sufferings of the martyrs of the past. For example, see *Passio Marculi* 1 (BHL 5271; PL 8, 760; trans. M. Tilley, op. cit. 78): *Iustum enim ac satis dignum est, ut antiquorum testium laudibus recentium quoque martyrum uirtus adiuncta glutinetur. Sicut enim illos gentilis saeuitia diabolo parens destinauit ad regnum; sic et hos traditorum rabies Antichristo seruiens misit ad coelum.* For one example of Donatist chagrin over the "Caecilianist" misappropriation of the term *Catholicus*, see *Sermo de Passione Sanctorum Donati et Aduocati* 12 (BHL-nov. suppl. 2303b; PL 8.757; trans. M. Tilley, op. cit. 58-9): *Nam et hoc ad iniuriam magnopere procurauit nominis inimicus, ut eam uulgo dici fecisset catholicam, ubi impune committitur quicquid publico iure damnatur.*

THE SALE OF MANI

BY

ANTHONY ALCOCK

The purpose of this brief note is to draw attention to passages in two sources quoted by S. Lieu in *Manichaeism in the Later Empire* (Tübingen, 1992) and in one source which has been the subject of a recent study by Madeline Scopello "La Vie de Mani selon les *Acta Archelai*" *Apocrypha* 6 (1995) pp. 203-234.[1] I suggest that the three passages are informed by the same tradition, a connection which is not made by either Dr. Lieu or Dr. Scopello.

The first passage is quoted on p. 36 in fn. 21. It is from Theodore bar Koni *Lib. Schol.* XI (published in CSCO LXVI p. 311, 13-19) and says that Mani was known as Qurqabios when he was a member of this sect and learned the doctrine of purification "because he was bought by the sect (lit. because they bought him)". The second passage is quoted on p. 46 fn. 76. It is from the Greek biographical compilation known as the *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis* (usually abbreviated to *CMC*) 73,8-74,5 and says that Mani lived among the Baptists quietly and unremarkably and that they treated him "according to the significance of his body (74,4-5)." The word "significance" renders the Greek τιμή. I suggest that the Greek word here does not mean "significance", but rather "price", and is confirmation of the passage quoted above.

The text known as *Acta Archelai* also records a tradition according to which Mani was sold, but as a slave to a rich widow when he was seven years old. Scopello (*art. cit.* p. 233) comments merely that this information about Mani's servile condition "s'agit vraisemblablement d'un renseignement polémique, en opposition aux légendes qui circulaient en Orient sur l'origine royale de Mani".

To summarise: two texts of Christian origin make mention of the sale of Mani, one into the Baptist sect into which he followed his father and one into the household of a rich widow, who then set him free; one text

[1] I am grateful to Prof. J. den Boeft for this reference.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

of Manichaean origin possibly (and this depends on how one understands a particular word) mentions the financial value attached to Mani by the abovementioned Baptist sect.

I am not and do not claim to be a Manichaean specialist and am therefore unable and unwilling to make any useful observation as to how the information provided in the sources quoted above is to be interpreted.

34213 Kassel, Zobelmühlenweg 28 BRD

REVIEWS

Das Martyrium des Polykarp, übersetzt und erklärt von Gerd Buschmann (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern. Sechster Band), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, 452 p., DM 158,—.

L'«Ergänzungsreihe zum Kritisch-exegetischen Kommentar über das Neue Testament» ne cesse pas de publier de volumineux commentaires sur les Pères Apostoliques. Avec le volume de B. nous nous trouvons de nouveau devant un travail de valeur. L'auteur s'était fait remarquer déjà par une monographie sur le *Martyre de Polycarpe* (*Martyrium Polycarpi—Eine formkritische Studie. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung der Gattung Märtyrerakte*, Berlin, 1994). Dans cet ouvrage aussi bien que dans le nouveau commentaire, B. se montre d'accord avec nous sur plus d'un élément critique concernant ce document précieux de la littérature chrétienne. Résumons surtout les points suivants: la date du Martyre doit être maintenue à peu près pour l'an 156, c.à.d. toutefois avant les années soixante du deuxième siècle. Le *Martyre de Polycarpe* est une véritable lettre: B. avait prêté beaucoup d'attention à cette question dans sa monographie de 1994. Encore, le texte est à accepter comme un document authentique et intègre: il n'y a donc pas question d'hypothèses d'interpolation qui se semblent maintenir toujours dans la littérature critique. Néanmoins, la monographie annonçait déjà une interprétation d'ensemble qui nous paraissait moins séduisante: la lettre des chrétiens smyrniotes serait conçue comme une critique précise de l'attitude montaniste à propos du martyre. C'est ce qui confirme le commentaire: «MartPol ist zunächst bemüht um eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Montanismus . . . In beinahe amtlichen Ton wird das Martyriumsverhalten der Montanisten missbilligt . . .» (p. 65). Pour B., il ne s'agit donc pas d'une critique presqu'en passant, à l'occasion du cas de Quintus décrit dans le ch. 4 de MartPol. Au contraire le texte contient une réaction élaborée et réfléchie vis-à-vis la *Nouvelle Prophétie*, prenant Polycarpe comme modèle de l'attitude correcte, «orthodoxe»: «in MartPol wird die Märtyrerthematik katholisch-orthodox usurpiert, in dem dem Bischof und Ketzerbekämpfer Polykarp das rechte Martyriumsverhalten zugeschrieben wird, gegen ein Drängen zum Martyrium . . .» (p. 65). Ce n'est pas difficile de

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

reconnaître les conséquences d'une telle position: la *Nouvelle Prophétie* s'est répandue en Asie mineure à une époque plus ancienne que l'on n'estime d'habitude: «In MartPol liegt die früheste literarische Bezeugung des Montanismus vor, die wir besitzen» (p. 172).

Nous avons déjà eu l'occasion de présenter quelque réflections sur cette interprétation audacieuse (*The Martyrdom of Polycarp and the Outbreak of Montanism*, dans *ETL* 75 [1999] 430-437), et il ne semble pas approprié de tout répéter. Présentons donc encore quelques notes de lecture qui pourraient permettre au lecteur de situer nos difficultés. B. a soin de revenir dans un excursus au problème de la fixation du terme technique de Μάρτυς = martyr (Die Fixierung des Begriffs Μάρτυς als term.techn. für den Blutzeugen im MartPol, pp. 98-105). B. reprend, à la suite de Kraft, Baumeister, Halkin e.a. (on pourrait ajouter H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'empire romain*, Bruxelles, 1964², 238-249) l'idée que la fixation se semble produire dans un «anti-schwärmerischem Kontext». Le témoin ne rend pas seulement témoignage avec ses paroles mais aussi avec ses actes qui correspondent avec sa confession: «In der Einforderung einer Übereinstimmung von Reden und Tun in anti-schwärmerischem Kontext scheint also der technische Μάρτυς-Begriff seine Wurzel zu haben» (p. 102; comp. p. 198). Est-il dès lors étonnant de trouver cette fixation comme un fait accompli dans le *Martyre de Polycarpe* qui dénonce l'«überstürzten Enthusiasmus» du Montanisme? L'hypothèse est séduisante, mais elle n'échappe pas à quelques difficultés. B. semble vouloir dire que le glissement sémantique se produit *dans* le *Martyre de Polycarpe* et se précise encore dans une intention polémique (p. 105, comp. p. 351). De notre côté, nous avons toujours défendu que le glissement sémantique s'est produit *avant* la rédaction du *Martyre de Polycarpe*, et que celle-ci reprend la notion dans sa nouvelle spécialisation. Polycarpe et ses compagnons sont «des martyrs», sans que cela doit recevoir, encore une précision. (Voir notre *Martyr—Martyrium. Quelques observations à propos d'un christianisme sémantique*, dans *Eulogia. Mélanges Bastiaensen*, Steenbrugge, 1991, 33-39). S'il est vrai que notre lecture du texte se trouve sur un niveau hagiographique plutôt que polémique, un passage tel que 17,1 («Mais l'envieux, le jaloux, le mauvais, l'adversaire de la race des justes, voyant la grandeur de son martyre et sa vie irréprochable dès le début, le voyant couronné de la couronne d'immortalité et emportant une récompense incontestée . . .») nous semble indiquer toutefois qu'il ne faut pas isoler l'expression Μάρτυς mais bien prendre en considération toute la terminologie du martyre.

En ce qui concerne le ch. 3, le commentaire de B. nous pose devant d'autres difficultés. Il s'agit du cas de Germanicus, le jeune chrétien courageux qui, par défi du proconsul, attire même la bête «voulant être plus vite délivré de cette vie injuste et inique» (3,1). Il fait peu de doute que le récit de Germanicus se présente en antithèse avec le cas de Quintus (ch. 4). Mais pourquoi introduire ici un développement laborieux sur la «Zwei-Wege-Lehre» (pp. 109-113)? On n'échappe pas à une impression d'artificiel, surtout que toutes les considérations dans ce genre ne peuvent pas dissimuler la difficulté que l'attitude de Germanicus correspond peu avec la doctrine anti-montaniste de MartPol de ne pas chercher le martyre!

Ce qui semble encore moins convaincant, ce sont les pages suivantes sur l'absence de noms de femmes dans MartPol: «Es ist nicht völlig abwegig, im Verschweigen von Frauen . . . einen antimontanistischen Affekt auszumachen» (p. 116). À notre avis il est simplement impossible de savoir si MartPol ait voulu introduire une silence à propos de martyrs féminins: le texte ne donne pas aucune indication.

Ces quelques exemples peuvent suffire pour donner une impression de nos réserves. Il nous semble aussi regrettable que B. a prêté peu d'attention au «Nachleben» de notre texte, surtout que le récit à propos de Polycarpe a fait impression. B. le reconnaît parfois (p. ex. p. 299 à propos des Actes de Paul et Thecla) mais il l'aurait pu mettre mieux en évidence. Dans le cas du *Martyrium Sabae* (p. 155) p. ex. Il est bien la question si cette référence peut servir comme témoin indépendant de la présentation de l'attitude paisible du martyr envers la persécution. Il est beaucoup plus probable que le récit sur Sabas dépend directement de MartPol (comp. p. 356) avec la description de la forme que prend le feu du bûcher. Il ne s'agit pas d'une «ähnliche Erzählung» mais bien d'une influence directe de notre texte. A vrai dire, on pourrait se douter que beaucoup de références données par le commentaire en témoignage d'une telle ou telle 'tradition' sont des emprunts directs au MartPol. C'est dire que l'histoire littéraire d'un document n'est pas sans importance pour son interprétation. Encore, le commentaire à propos des appendices (ch. 21-22) est assez réduit. Remarquons dans ce contexte que la question concernant la *Vita Polycarpi* à été reposée récemment par A. Stewart-Sykes (*Vita Polycarpi: An Ante-Nicene Vita*, dans *Augustinianum* 40 [2000] 21-23) sans qu'il nous a pu convaincre de modifier nos idées sur l'importance oui ou non d'un Corpus Polycarpianum (cf. *Martyrium Polycarpi*, Leuven, 1979, 41-44; 63-69). Concluons néanmoins en répétant que ces remarques n'enlèvent en

rien l'importance du travail de B. Son commentaire restera pour longtemps une œuvre de référence pour ceux qu'étudient le MartPol.

Faculteit Godgeleerdheid, BOUDEWIJN DEHANDSCHUTTER
St. Michielsstraat 6,
B-3000 *Leuven*

Frederick W. Weidmann, *Polycarp & John. The Harris Fragments and Their Challenge to the Literary Tradition* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series. Volume 12), Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1999, xvi + 189 p.

Les «*Harris Fragments*» ont commencé à nous intéresser depuis que U. Zanetti publiait une note sur le catalogue des acquisitions de la *British Library* en ce qui concerne les textes littéraires coptes (*Un catalogue des additions coptes de Londres*, dans *Analecta Bollandiana* 106, 1988, 171-181; voir B. Layton, *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired since the Year 1906*, London, 1987). Cet ouvrage mentionne des textes sur *Polycarpe de Smyrne*, évêque et martyr. Nous étions bien curieux de trouver une autre version copte du martyre que celle en bohairique publiée par E. Amélineau en 1886. La *British Library* a eu la bienveillance de nous procurer des photos des textes sur Polycarpe. Il s'agissait de quatre fragments de papyrus en saïdique catalogués comme Or. 7561, nos 55,56,63 et 64. Il a paru assez vite que le contenu de ces fragments ne correspondait pas à la version connue du martyre de Polycarpe. Ayant laissé reposer ce problème quelque temps, nous avons appris que F. Weidmann préparait un doctorat sur ces fragments (Yale, 1993). Et voici le livre issu de ce doctorat, qui nous apprend dès la première page: «FrgPol (= *Harris Fragments*) provides an important and unique complement to the ancient literature associated with Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and with the apostle John» (p. 1). Ce complément unique consiste dans le fait que selon le texte le martyre de Polycarpe a été une nécessité à cause de la mort pacifique de l'apôtre Jean. Dès lors, son élève, resté comme dernier des disciples des apôtres, a du mourir d'une mort d'apôtre c.à.d. le martyre en guise de «Stellvertretung». En effet, un des passages les plus lisibles du texte raconte que les disciples, essayant de cacher le vieil évêque, ont peur de lui raconter pourquoi: «. . . lest he forbid them and go alone to the lawcourt. For they had heard him say many times: «It is necessary that I die by the lawcourt, in the manner that the apostle of the Lord told me when he

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

said, 'Since the Lord granted to me that I die on my bed, it is necessary that you die by the lawcourt . . .'» (traduction de Weidmann, p. 47).

L'auteur étudie dans son introduction les données sur Polycarpe et sur sa mort dans la littérature paléo-chrétienne ainsi que l'histoire des «*Harris Fragments*». Le premier chapitre offre alors une reconstruction et édition du texte des fragments, en total six pages dont aucune est complète: page a = fragm. 63v; page b = fragm. 63r; page c = fragm. 64r+56v; page d = fragm. 64v+56r; page e = fragm. 55v; page f = fragm. 55r. L'édition est accompagnée d'un registre de parallèles et de notes de critique textuelle. Le deuxième chapitre contient la traduction anglaise et l'indication d'autres restaurations possibles. Le troisième chapitre essaie d'établir la «narrative strategy» du texte. Weidmann arrive à une structure en deux parties, la première concernant l'apôtre et sa relation avec Polycarpe, la deuxième concernant la mort de ce dernier. Mais les deux unités appartiennent bien à une même «stratégie»: établir comment la mort de Polycarpe est une mort apostolique qui «remplace» la mort pacifique de Jean. Le quatrième chapitre présente un commentaire sur le texte existant qui essaie de placer les données textuelles souvent réduites dans un contexte d'interprétation plus large. Le cinquième chapitre revient aux traditions sur Jean et son disciple et essaie de comprendre le message du texte à la lumière de la rivalité entre Ephèse et Smyrne à propos de la question des origines apostoliques des deux communautés chrétiennes. L'ouvrage de Weidmann contient une édition photographique des fragments et conclut avec une bibliographie (pp. 157-175) et des indexes (pp. 177-189).

Il va sans dire que la présentation d'un tel texte peut inspirer à pas mal de remarques sur les traditions concernant l'apôtre Jean et Polycarpe. W. les considère avec soin, avec une attention particulière aux données nouvelles des *Fragments*. Certes, il est toujours possible de se demander, devant un texte tellement lacuneux, si son éditeur n'a pas été trop optimiste dans la reconstruction. Ainsi, il y a par exemple une question qui reste à propos du début: est-il certain que le texte a commencé par la référence à la répartition des champs de mission parmi les apôtres? Encore, dans la présentation actuelle, ce qui reste du martyre de Polycarpe, donne l'impression d'un rôle prépondérant des Juifs. Peut-être qu'une connaissance plus complète de l'ouvrage corrigerait-elle cette impression?

Mais il est impossible de savoir. Il faut se tenir à un texte transmis très partiellement, et en dériver selon le possible ses particularités. En ce qui concerne le martyre, il est évident que le rôle d'Hérode, connu comme l'irénarque dans le récit du *Martyrium Polycarpi*, est présenté différemment:

dans le texte des Fragments c'est lui qui veut expressément la mort de l'évêque. Aussi la conscience de Polycarpe devant sa mort est établie autrement, ainsi que les événements qui entourent l'essai des disciples de le cacher. Et la consolation des disciples de la part de Polycarpe par le Psaume 93,14 reste singulière. Notre connaissance du texte s'interrompt fatalement à ce point de sorte qu'on ne sait rien de la présentation de la mort même de Polycarpe (sauf que l'évêque prévoit toujours une mort par le feu? Voir page f.).

Si nous avons bien compris Weidmann, il est important de noter que notre texte «is more than a martyrdom» (p. 53), et que donc la première partie est également d'importance. Nous nous permettons deux remarques à cet égard. En premier lieu, il nous semble que la page c aurait pu appartenir aussi à un récit de martyre, surtout qu'elle aurait pu être précédée par deux ou même plusieurs pages (cf. p. 25). En deuxième lieu, le contenu de la page b n'est pas du tout sans équivoque. Elle semble dire de Jean (mais le texte lisible ne donne pas de nom!) qu'il a «fait» Polycarpe l'évêque de Smyrne (comp. les observations de Weidmann, pp. 69-77). On sait que ce lien précis de l'apôtre avec son disciple ne se manifeste que depuis Tertullien (*Prescription contre les hérétiques* 32,2). Irénée est beaucoup moins affirmatif. Même dans le passage crucial de l'*Adv. Haer. III*, 3,4 il parle de l'ordination de Polycarpe par *les* apôtres. Sans vouloir recommencer ici tout le débat, il ne nous semble pas à tort que l'on a compris les mots de Tertullien comme une interprétation des textes d'Irénée. On pourrait se trouver devant le même phénomène dans le cas des *Fragments*, même à ce point qu'il faudrait se demander qu'on ne pourrait pas expliquer tout comme une «relecture» des données d'Irénée. Ce n'est pas notre intention de faire tort aux recherches de Weidmann, mais nous ne pouvons pas le suivre en prenant en compte la tradition présente dans le *Quis Dives* de Clément d'Alexandrie à propos de Jean l'apôtre (cf. pp. 78-79.131).

Quoi qu'il en soit, revenons encore un instant aux traditions concernant le martyre. Weidmann note que nous connaissons le texte «traditionnel» sous une double forme, celle du Pseudo-Pionius et celle d'Eusèbe. Il ne semble pas reconnaître suffisamment que le texte d'Eusèbe *dépend* du Pseudo-Pionius, et de telle sorte, il ne constitue pas un témoignage indépendant du martyre. On se demandera dès lors quelle rôle il peut jouer pour situer une tradition sur Polycarpe qui date du début du troisième siècle (voir p. 147). Il en va de même pour la traduction en copte bohaïrique, laquelle selon Weidmann «though clearly indepted to the Eusebian text tradition, includes significant, unique characteristics» (p. 3). Nous n'avons pas été en

mesure de les discerner: comme nous l'avions déjà établi, la version bohaïrique a introduit quelques éléments du récit d'Irénée et s'est adaptée au contexte «hagiographique» copte (*Martyrium Polycarpi*, Louvain, 1979, 54-55). Pour nous la difficulté reste d'utiliser un tel témoin pour mieux situer le contenu des Fragments. Tout comme le texte d'Eusèbe, le bohaïrique indique qu'il y a eu dans l'histoire littéraire bien des adaptations de la 'Lettre des Smyrniotes' c.à.d. le *Martyrium Polycarpi* (voir encore la «*Vie et Martyre de Polcarpe*» du codex mosquensis 376), mais il nous semble prudent d'en rester à cette constatation.

Cependant, malgré toute apparence, le livre de Weidmann ne nous a pas déçu. Il traite d'une manière savante et perspicace ce que les *'Harris Fragments'* ont arraché à l'oubli d'un texte que les chrétiens d'autrefois ont transmis à propos du célèbre évêque. Seulement on aurait préféré apprendre quelque chose de plus sur les circonstances dans lesquelles le texte dont témoignent les Fragments a été traduit en copte et comment donc notre Saint a été introduit dans le dossier hagiographique de la chrétienté égyptienne, ce qui n'est pas une évidence, comme Amélineau l'a fait remarquer jadis à l'occasion de son édition de la version bohaïrique (voir à ce propos encore W. Clarysse, *The Coptic Martyr Cult*, in *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective*, Louvain, 1995, 377-395; et T. Baumeister, *Martyr Invictus*, Münster, 1972).

Faculteit Godgeleerdheid,
St. Michielsstraat 6,
B-3000 *Leuven*

BOUDEWIJN DEHANDSCHUTTER

P. Allen, W. Mayer & L. Cross (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, Volume 2, Brisbane, Centre for Early Christian Studies of the Australian Catholic University, 1999. ISBN 0-9577483-0-2, 440 p., Aus. $ 45.

The second part of the series *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church* has now appeared. This volume contains a selection of the papers presented at a conference held in Sydney in January 1999.

Like the first part, this second contains several valuable articles. There are seven sections: I—The Foundations; II—Prayer and Spirituality; III—Accessing the Divine; IV—On the Fringe; V—Reinterpreting the Tradition; VI—Pastor and Bishop; VII—Living Spirituality.

J. Kevin Coyle raises the question: 'What was "Prayer" for the Early

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Christians?' Until now, the author argues, scholars have concentrated more on *describing* and *collecting* the prayers of the Christians in the first centuries than on asking how those prayers *worked*. Coyle ventures to say that the Christians never definitively broke with the culture to which they had belonged before their conversion. Therefore their prayer preserved some characteristics of its Jewish and pagan counterparts. For example, Christians prayed standing, with arms lifted or outstretched, as was done by both Jews and pagans. The *interpretation* of these gestures, however, might be different for the adherents of the new religion.

Manuel Belda discusses 'The Concept of Continual Prayer according to John Cassian'. For Cassian, continual prayer is no less than the immediate objective of the monk's life. It consists in the constant recollection or the continual remembrance of God. Unfortunately, such a state of mind is continually assailed by many distractions. Certain 'formulae' may help the monk to be perpetually aware of God's presence, like the 'Our Father' and the Old Testament *Shema*.

In a very original contribution, Angelo Casanova examines some echoes of epic and dramatic poetry in Gregory of Nyssa's works. In *De rebus suis* (*Concerning his own Affairs*) for instance, one finds a prayer that is clearly based on classical Greek examples. The narrative of Gregory's *De vita sua* (*Concerning his own Life*) reminds one of the oratorical self-defence in trimeters that is common in Greek tragedy. On the whole, Euripides seems to have been Gregory's favourite author.

There are three contributions on St Augustine in this volume. Kazuhiko Demura clarifies the concept of '*Cor nostrum* in the *Confessions* of St Augustine'. Friendship appears to have been the central concern of the saint's heart. So we should not read the *Confessions* as the expression of a self-centred or individualistic mind. For the bishop of Hippo, not only his personal friends but even the whole community committed to his care were of primary importance. Finally, he acknowledged a close relationship between the whole order of created beings and his own heart.

Bronwen Neil points to the 'Neo-Platonic Influence on Augustine's Conception of the Ascent of the Soul in *De quantitate animae*'. In this early work, Augustine was still confident of reason's capacity to attain to the truth. He used his Neo-Platonic sources selectively in order to produce a genuinely Christian view of the relationship between the soul and the body, between the intelligible and sensible worlds, and between God and creation. The topic Neil deals with is certainly important, but it necessarily leans on much older research.

In a very short article, Takeshi Kato discusses the term *idipsum* in Augustine's *Confessions*. As the author admits, the Church Father himself never asks what *idipsum* is. Kato arrives at the meagre conclusion that Augustine 'comes to know *idipsum* by listening to *idipsum*'s voice (p. 225)'. Maybe the author should not have posed this question either.

The editors ought to be praised because they did not economise on the plates in this book. A magnificent series of reproductions accompanies Margaret Manion's article on early illuminated Gospel books. The same goes for Joan Barclay Lloyd's contribution on the history of the Church of San Clemente in Rome. Not in the last place because of these embellishments, it is a pleasure to have this wide-ranging volume.

NL – 3583 AD *Utrecht*, Adr. van Ostadelaan 109 B H.G. SCHIPPER

Sulpice Sévère, *Chroniques*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire par Ghislaine de Senneville-Grave (Sources Chrétiennes 441). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf., 1999. 538 p., 255 F.

On connaît Sulpice Sévère surtout de par sa *Vie de saint Martin*, qui a remporté un grand succès auprès de ses contemporains. Ses *Chroniques*, par contre, oeuvre biblio-historique rédigée vers 403, furent presqu' oubliées, à preuve qu'un seul manuscrit en fut transmis. Grâce à la sympathie qu'éprouvèrent les réformateurs pour les idées ascétiques de l'auteur, les éditions furent multipliées au XVIe siècle, ce qui garantit à ces annales leur survivance.

Au fond, la majeure partie des *Chroniques* ne fait que récapituler l'histoire du salut comme exposée dans les Saintes Écritures (y compris quelques livres apocryphes). Mais la finale de cette oeuvre se révèle plus intéressante. Ici, Sulpice décrit l'histoire des hérésies arienne et priscillienne. Notamment quant à ce dernier mouvement, le chroniqueur fournit des informations indispensables.

Les *Chroniques* ont été publiées dans la célèbre collection des *Sources Chrétiennes* par Ghislaine de Senneville-Grave. Dans son 'Introduction', elle défend Sulpice contre toute accusation de millénarisme. Certes, la conception que le monde n'existera pas plus que 6000 ans est très chère à cet historien. Pourtant, il n'épouse pas l'opinion millénariste que Jésus régnera pendant une période de 1000 ans entre la résurrection des saints et le jour du Jugement dernier.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

De Senneville-Grave nous offre une traduction bien fiable, qui ne provoque que quelques remarques de détail. On s'étonne de la traduction assez littérale du mot *Allophyli* par 'Allophyles' (au lieu de 'Philistins'). Apparemment, elle ne trouve rien à sourire que Sulpice date la construction des pyramides du IIe siècle A. C. (II, 25, 1). Dans son commentaire, elle se borne à constater que 'ces mausolées étaient connus du monde chrétien' (p. 418). Du reste, cet ouvrage doit être accueilli comme un enrichissement des études de la littérature chrétienne primitive.

NL – 3583 AD *Utrecht*, Adr. van Ostadelaan 109 B H.G. SCHIPPER

R.M. Grant, *Early Christians and Animals*. London-New York: Routledge, 1999. x + 214 pp. ISBN 0-415-20204-3. Price £45 (hb).

In this book Robert Grant examines the significance of animals in early Christian thought. He has divided it into seven sections. The first deals with biblical animals and among others with vegetarianism and dietary laws. In the second chapter he examines the tales about unusual animals like the sea monster in Jonah and the lion in the apocryphal Acts of Paul and in the third the stories about unreal animals like centaurs, dragons, the phoenix, the unicorn and others. The largest part of the book (chapters four to seven) consists of a translation of the *Physiologus*, Basil's *Homilies on the Hexaemeron* 7, 8 and part of 9 and Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies* XI, 3-4 and XII,1-8. En passant he gives some information about Alexandrians, Antiochenes and Latin Fathers.

His comment in the notes on the translated passages refers mainly to (pagan) sources like Aristotle and Pliny and much less to Christian parallels. It would have been more interesting if he had also given insight in the theological background.

The *Physiologus* for instance is written from an ascetic and anti-docetic point of view. And why are Christians interested in animals and nature in general? Is it because they were all God's creatures? Or because some Christians had adopted the macro-/microcosmos-theme: man as integrated in the entire cosmos to such a degree that a sort of parallellism exists between the macrocosmos and the microcosmos? Then animals, plants and minerals can teach us a lot about man and also about God. For what cannot be seen of God has "been visible, ever since the world began . . . in the things He has made," as Paul says (Rom. 1,20).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

If Grant had chosen that way, it would also have been possible to say more about Origen than that he "uses anecdotes about animals and birds to provide moral models" (p. 49). No word is devoted either to the Christian appreciation of nature: how Gregory of Nyssa enjoyed the return of the first migrant birds (*Ep.* 9) and Basil described the restless movement of the cattle in their stalls, when spring returns (*Hom. in Hexaem.* 9,3). Grant, in his translation of this passage, passes it without comment. So the author gives us a lot of material and a very readable translation of relevant passages, but I regret the fact that this book does not give us more background information. Then we would have had a clearer understanding of the interpretation and appreciation of animals by the early Christians.

NL – 7681 GJ *Vroomshoop*, Bosweg 12 F. LEDEGANG

N. Joseph Torchia, *'Creatio ex nihilo' and the Theology of St. Augustine. The Anti-Manichaean Polemic and Beyond* (American university studies. Series VII, Theology of religion; vol. 205). Peter Lang, New York – Washington, D.C./Baltimore – Boston – Bern – Frankfurt am Main – Berlin – Vienna – Paris 1999. xxv + 279 pp., ISBN 0-8204-3775-1, $ 49.95 (hard cover)

N. Joseph Torchia (Community of the Immaculate Conception, Washington D.C.) is a specialist in philosophy and early Christian studies. In this book, he deals with *creatio ex nihilo* and St. Augustine's theology. This theme is important, because it focuses on a crucial, but rather neglected area. Torchia stresses the importance of *creatio ex nihilo* for Augustine's rejection of Manichaean dualism. Because he emphasizes the anti-Manichaean element in the Church Father's doctrine of creation, his study also sheds light on the profound influence of Manichaeism in Augustine's thinking.

In the *Preface*, Torchia unfolds his wide-ranging program which is carried out in the subsequent chapters: a description of the emergence of the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* in Christianity from Holy Scripture to St. Ambrose (*Introduction*); a discussion of Manichaean sources on cosmogony (*Chapter 1*); Augustine's exegesis of *Genesis* especially in the context of his Scriptural commentaries (*Chapter 2*); and an examination of the Church Father's refutation of the Manichaean vision of reality in the treatise *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti liber* (*Chapter 3*). Two perennial subjects are dealt with in *Chapter 4* (Augustine's theodicy) and *Chapter 5* (Augustine's

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

defence of monotheism). In *Chapter 6*, Torchia gives a concise summary of his findings. As a kind of reprise, Torchia explores some points that he views as outgrowths of Augustine's belief in *creatio ex nihilo* (*Chapter 7*).

Especially the first chapter on the Manichaean cosmogony calls for some critical remarks. It is highly regrettable that the author does not make use of primary sources to describe the Manichaean cosmogony; although, in the *Preface*, he promised to do so. Torchia depends mostly on the translations of the *Liber Scholiorum* of Theodore bar Khôni and an-Nadim's *Fihrist*. Although the latter's historical account now appears to be quite reliable, it is still not a *primary* source. In the past century, new findings provided students of Manichaeism with a rich collection of original Manichaean writings. These should not be ignored in a scholarly treatise on Augustine.

Besides, Torchia seems to have overlooked the most recent studies on Manichaeism; for he mainly depends on more or less outdated studies like H.-Ch. Puech's *Le Manichéisme* (1949) and even G. Widengren's contested *Mani and Manichaeism* (1965; translation of *Mani und der Manichäismus*, 1961). These works still have some value, but they are *not* representative of the current state of research. A positive exception is Torchia's reference to Samuel N.C. Lieu's *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Nevertheless, he only used the very defective first edition (1985); the second, thoroughly rewritten edition (1992), however, contains many new insights: especially on Mani's youth with the Elchasaite Baptists (who were not Mandaeans, as Torchia seems to believe, 66). Besides, Torchia does not really discuss the pivotal opinions of Lieu and many other scholars, e.g. on the Judeo-Christian background of the Manichaean religion. Due to his rather poor attempt to understand Manichaeism, Torchia's biographical remarks on Mani are superficial and his description of the nature of the Manichaean religion is disappointing ('. . . an amalgam of elements drawn from Persian Zoroastrianism, Christianity and Buddhism', 66). A discussion of the Judeo-Christian background of Manichaeism would have been highly valuable in this study on creation, as the Manichaean myth contains biblical names like Adam, Seth and Enos.

At the end of the first chapter, Torchia briefly discusses (2 pp.) the question of Augustine's authority on Manichaeism. Although Torchia makes a right choice, as he decides this question in favour of Augustine, his arguments should be augmented with the observation that the reliability of Augustine's description of the Manichaean doctrines has been confirmed by recently discovered Manichaean sources (cf. e.g. J. van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism & Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism & Its Influence on Western Christianity*, Tbilisi 1996, esp. 41-45).

In addition, I also want to make two other remarks. First: I wonder why, in the first part of the rather long *Introduction* (almost a quarter of the book), the author only deals with three Scriptural references: i.e. 2 *Maccabees* 7:28, *Genesis* 1:1ff. and *Wisdom* 11:17. A discussion of the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel could have been expected, as this passage plays a major role in Augustine's dispute with the Manichaeans about creation, as both he and his opponents quoted from the same biblical source (cf. *Contra Adimantum* I, *sermo* 1 etc.).

Second: In *Chapter* 2 (p. 115), Torchia says: '. . . Augustine's exegesis of *Genesis* 1 provided the very basis for his interpretation of the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*.' However, the opposite view seems to be more correct: Augustine's interpretation of the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* provided the very basis of his exegesis of *Genesis* 1: as is shown by his explicit statement in *De Genesi ad litteram liber unus imperfectus*, that he wants to give his explanation of *Genesis* on the basis of the Christian belief (cf. II, 5: Secundum hanc fidem . . . considerandum est *In principio fecit Deus coelum et terram*). The commentaries on *Genesis* are not exegesis in our sense of the word. Augustine tried to find a way to explain the creation-account: viz. that it was consistent with the Christian creed and acceptable to the Christians; as well as to reject Manichaean derision of it.

Apart from these remarks, I also note that this book contains some annoying inaccuracies, like the inadequate quoting of authors. E.g., p. 95 n. 90: F. Decret can never have challenged John P. Maher in his *Aspects du Manichéisme*, for Maher wrote some nine years later. Besides, Decret's *Aspects* does not consists of two volumes (as Torchia says here) but one. Further, several typographical errors are found: e.g. *Secundius* (p. 95: Secundinus), *dilemna* (p. 204), *De Natura Boni Manichaeum* (p. 230); etc.

Despite these criticisms, the book is certainly to be considered as a readable study of Augustine's theology of *creatio ex nihilo*. The author has succeeded in showing the importance of this theological concept to other subjects such as monotheism and the problem of evil. Besides, the effectiveness of belief in *creatio ex nihilo* in the rejection of Manichaean teachings has been sufficiently emphasized.

NL-9746 TN *Groningen*, Hoogeweg 2 J.A. VAN DEN BERG

BOOKS RECEIVED

Alfeyev, Hilarion, *St. Symeon the New Theologian and Orthodox Tradition*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press 2000, xiv + 338 pp., ISBN 0-19-827009-7, £ 48.00 (cloth with book jacket).—'A study of the mystical nature of tradition, and the traditional nature of mysticism, and of St Symeon as both a highly personal and very traditional ecclesiastical writer'.

Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza, Correspondence, volume II: *Aux cénobites*, Tome I, *Lettres* 224-398. Texte critique, notes et index par François Neyt & Paula de Angelis-Noah, traduction par L[ucien] Regnault (Sources Chrétiennes 450), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2000, 461 p., ISBN 2-204-06489-0, FF 186 (broché).

Behr, John, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press 2000, xi + 261 pp., ISBN 0-19-827000-3, £ 40.00 (cloth with book jacket).—'[The book] also offers a theological critique of the prevailing approach [e.g. by M. Foucault and P. Brown] to the asceticism of Late Antiquity'.

Bockmuehl, Markus, *Jewish Law in the Gentile Churches. Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 2000, xvii + 314 pp., ISBN 0-567-08734-4, £ 24.95 (hardback with jacket).—Collection of nine highly qualified studies, seven of them more or less rewritten and updated to fit the present volume, two of them in first publication: Ch. 6: 'Natural Law in the New Testament?'; Ch. 8: 'The Beginning of Christian Public Ethics: From Luke to Aristides and *Diognetus*'. With extensive Bibliography and Indices.

Brown, Charles Thomas, *The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch* (Studies in Biblical Literature 12), New York etc.: Peter Lang 2000, xiii + 244 pp., ISBN 0-8204-4132-5, SFR 77,00 (hb).—'. . . follows the established thesis that there is no evidence that Ignatius has literary dependence on any of the Synoptic Gospels. Rather, . . . Ignatius appeals most strongly to the Pauline expression of the gospel, with an emphasis on the oral, preached nature of the gospel'.

Burrus, Virginia, *'Begotten, not made'. Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press 2000, xvi + 240 pp., ISBN 0-8047-3706-1, £ 30.00 (cloth).

Burton, Philip, *The Old Latin Gospels. A Study of their Texts and Language*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press 2000, xi + 232 pp., ISBN 0-19-826988-9, £ 45.00 (cloth with book jacket).

Carey, Philipp, *Augustine's Invention of the Inner Self. The Legacy of a Christian Platonist*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press 2000, xvii + 214 pp., ISBN 0-19-513206-8, £ 30.00 (cloth with book jacket).

Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. Translated and with Commentary by Martin Abegg Jr, Peter Flint & Eugene Ulrich, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1999, xxii + 649 pp., ISBN 0-567-08715-8, £ 24.95 (hardback with jacket).—'The oldest known versions of the books of the Bible translated for the first time into English'.

Declercq, Georges, *Anno Domini. The Origins of the Christian Era*, Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 206 pp., ISBN 2-503-51050-7, 20 EUR (pb).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Deutsch, Nathaniel, *Guardians of the Gate. Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1999, xi + 182 pp., ISBN 90-04-10909-9, DFL 108/US $ 63.50 (clothbound with book jacket).—'The first part . . . is devoted to the question of mediation in Late Antiquity and to the role of exegesis in the formation of vice regent myths. The second part examines the Jewish figures Metatron and Akatriel, the Mandaean figure Abathur, and the Gnostic figure Sabaoth. After a final chapter on the types of communities which may have produced these myths, the volume concludes with appendices which briefly examine Christian, Muslim, and Hermetic traditions'.

Ellis, E. Earle, *The Making of the New Testament Documents* (Biblical Interpretation Series 39), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1999, xxiii + 517 pp., 1 map, ISBN 90-04-11332-0, DFL 245/US $ 144.50 (cloth).—Impressive new volume of the well-known New Testament and patristic scholar. E. argues 'that four cooperating apostolic missions each produced a Gospel and several letters and faced the same judaizing-gnosticizing countermission'. With extensive discussion of e.g. patristic and other ancient Christian writings.

Funk,Wolf-Peter (Hrsg.), *Kephalaia I*, Zweite Hälfte, Lieferung 15/16 (Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Band I), Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln: Kohlhammer 2000, 128 S., ISBN 3-17-016371-X, DM 152,55/öS 1114/sFr 136,— Edition des koptischen Textes mit einer Übersetzung im Deutschen der S. 367-440 des berühmten Berliner *Kephalaia*-Codex.

Geljon, A.C., *Moses as Example. The Philonic Background of Gregory of Nyssa's De vita Moysis*, Ph. Diss. Leiden University (promotor D.T. Runia) 2000, [obtainable from the author: IJsbaan 175, NL-4206 CD Gorinchem], vii + 243 pp. (pb).

Grégoire de Nysse, *Discours catéchétique*. Texte de E. Mühlenberg (*GNO* III, IV). Introduction, traduction et notes par R. Winling (Sources Chrétiennes 453), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2000, 360 p., ISBN 2-204-06471-8, FF 222 (broché).—'L'importance de cette œuvre découle du fait que c'est une *somme* de la doctrine chrétienne visant à donner de celle-ci une vue d'ensemble dans le cadre de l'histoire du salut'.

Gregorius Nyssenus: *Lexicon Gregorianum. Wörterbuch zu den Schriften Gregors von Nyssa.* Band II: βαβαί-δωροφορία Bearbeitet von Friedhelm Mann. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xii + 555 S., ISBN 90-04-11450-5, DFL 495,13/US $ 276 (Leinen).—Eindrucksvoller Band II des neuen Lexikons, bearbeitet von dem bekannten Spezialisten Friedhelm Mann und herausgegeben von der Forschungsstelle Gregor von Nyssa an der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität in Münster (BRD). Leitung: Wolf-Dieter Hauschild.

Hengel, Martin, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (translated from the German by John Bowden), Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International 2000, xii + 354 pp., ISBN 1-56338-300-4, $ 30.00 (pb).—E.g. on the question of 'why the church in forming its canon of scripture, the New Testament, chose to include four different and sometimes contradictory accounts of the life of Jesus when others, like Tatian and Marcion, opted for a harmony or one account'. With extensive discussion of, *inter alia*, the many early patristic and gnostic references.

Hippolyt: *Hippolyt Werke*, Erster Band, erster Teil: *Kommentar zu Daniel.* Herausgegeben von Georg Nathanael Bonwetsch. Zweite, vollständig veränderte Auflage von Marcel Richard (Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge, Band 7), Berlin: Akademie Verlag 2000, xlvii + 408 S., ISBN 3-05-003456-4 (Leinen).

Isidore de Péluse, *Lettres*, II, *Lettres* 1414-1700. Texte critique, traduction et notes par

Pierre Évieux (Sources Chrétiennes 454), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2000, 521 p., ISBN 2-204-06516-1, FF 258 (broché).

Klein, Richard, *Die Haltung der kappadokischen Bischöfe Basilius von Caesarea, Gregor von Nazianz und Gregor von Nyssa zur Sklaverei* (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei XXXII), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2000, VIII + 306 S., ISBN 3-515-07746-4, DM/sFr 96,— /öS 701,— (Kart.).

Manichaica Latina, Band 1, *Epistula ad Menoch*. Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterungen von Markus Stein (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sonderreihe Papyrologica Coloniensia XXVII/1), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag 1998, XVII + 95 S., ISBN 3-531-09946-9, DM 58,—/ÖS 423,—/SFr 52,50 (Engl. Broschur).

Marc le Moine, *Traités*, II. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par G.-M. de Durand (Sources Chrétiennes 455), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2000, 380 p., ISBN 2-204-06584-6, FF 233 (broché).

Meis, Anneliese, Antonio Castellano, Juan Francisco Pinilla, *El dinamismo del encuentro entre Dios y el Hombre, en los comentarios al* Cantar de los Cantares *de Orígenes, Gregorio de Nisa y Juan de la Cruz*, Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile: Santiago, Chile 2000, 245 pp., ISBN 956-14-0570-9 (pb).

Müller, Barbara, *Der Weg des Weinens. Die Tradition des 'Penthos' in den Apophthegmata Patrum* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 77), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 2000, 284 S., ISBN 3-525-55185-1, DM 98,— (Geb.).

O'Loughlin, Thomas, *Celtic Theology. Humanity, World and God in Early Irish Writings*, London & New York: Continuum 2000, xv + 235 pp., ISBN 0-8264-4871-2, £ 16.99/US $ 28.95 (pb).

Paulinus Nolanus: Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani, *Epistulae*, edidit Guilelmus de Hartel. Editio altera supplementis aucta curante Margit Kamptner (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum XXIX), Vindobonae: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1999, XXVIII + 462 S., ISBN 3-7001-2864-9 (broschiert).

Runia, D.T. (with the assistance of H.M. Keizer and in collaboration with the International Philo Bibliography Project), *Philo of Alexandria. An Annotated Bibliography 1987-1996, with Addenda for 1937-1986* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae LVII), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xxii + 412 pp., ISBN 90-04-11682-6, DFL 220,37/US $ 123 (clothbound with book jacket).—This exhaustive bibliography is a remarkable achievement, being the continuation of Roberto Radice & David Runia, *Philo of Alexandria, An Annotated Bibliography 1973-1986*, Leiden etc.: Brill 1987 (1996²). The book provides 'a complete listing of all scholarly writings on Philo in all languages for the period 1987 to 1996. Part One lists texts, translations, commentaries etc. (75 items). Part Two contains critical studies (880 items). In Part Three additional works for the years 1937-1986 are presented (170 items). In all cases a brief description of the contents of the contribution is given. Seven indices, including a detailed Index of subjects, complete the work'.

Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)*, 4. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, Frankfurt am Main usw.: Peter Lang 1999, 795 S., ISBN 3-631-33945-3, sFR 143,— (Geb.)./Heinz Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte (11.-13. Jh.). Mit einer Ikonographie des Judenthemas bis zum 4. Laterankonzil*, 3. ergänzte Auflage, Frankfurt am Main usw.: Peter Lang 1997, 739 S., ISBN 3-631-31665-8, sFR 103,— (Geb.).—Neuauflagen der eindrucksvollen und viel diskutierten Materialsammlung. Ein dritter Band wird im Vorwort

zur 4. Auflage von Bd. I angekündigt: *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (13.-20. Jh.)*.

Stead, Christopher, *Doctrine and Philosophy in Early Christianity. Arius, Athanasius, Augustine* (Variorum Collected Studies Series CS224, Aldershot, UK etc.: Ashgate 2000, xviii + 296 pp., ISBN 0-86078-830-X, £ 55.00.—Collection of twenty-one studies by this eminent patristic scholar, among them two first publications (XVI: The IntelligibleWorld in Platonic Tradition, Marius Victorinus and Augustine; XVII: Augustine's Universe), and a new Addendum on Augustine's *De magistro*. With a fairly extensive Introduction (ix-xviii), and an Index.

Theodoretus of Cyrus, *Commentary on the Psalms. Psalms 1-72*. Translated by Robert C. Hill (The Fathers of the Church. A New Translation 101). Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press 2000, xiv + 437 pp., ISBN 0-8132-0101-2, US $ 39.95 (cloth with book jacket).

READING PSALM 4 TO THE MANICHEANS

BY

ANNEMARÉ KOTZÉ

This article is joining a number of voices that have been going up in recent years, pointing to the (anti-)Manichean content and purpose of Augustine's *Confessions*.[1] It is specific and limited in scope, looking only at one short passage (*Conf.* IX.4.8-11) for the attitude towards the Manicheans it reveals, but it also suggests reasons why particularly this aspect of this passage might be important for our understanding of the *Confessions* as a whole.

That Augustine's account of his reading of Ps. 4 (*Conf.* IX.4.8-11) was something unparalleled in ancient literature has been pointed out by O'Donnell and affirmed by Stock.[2] That the *Confessions* are at least partly anti-Manichean in content is a fact that is widely known and is receiving more attention in the wake of the discovery of and heightened interest in Manichean documents.[3] This knowledge however does not prepare the reader for the strong positive emotion towards the Manicheans revealed

---

[1] More specifically, this article is an elaboration on the remarks made on *Conf.* IX (246-247) by J. van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism in Augustine's *Confessiones, Manichaean Studies III, Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico"* (1997) 235-247. For the importance of taking into account Manichean issues when interpreting the *Confessions*, see also e.g. J. van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme, *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 47 (1993) 276-291; D. Chidester, The symmetry of word and light: perceptual categories in Augustine's Confessions, *Augustinian Studies* 17 (1986) 119-133. Although this line of study has been pursued by some scholars for quite a few years now, it has not yet become part of the main stream research on the *Confessions*. James J. O'Donell's excellent introduction in his *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1992), refers to this line of research only implicitly and in passing, vol. 1, xvii-li.

[2] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 91 (above n. 1); Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1996).

[3] For an overview of the work on Manichean texts see J. Ries, La Bible chez saint Augustin et chez les manichéens, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 9 (1963) 201-215 and Johannes van Oort, *Mani, Manichaesim and Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism and Its Influence on Western Christianity* (Tbilisi 1996) 7-24 and 39, note 1. Van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism (above n. 1) also shows that a lot of work still has to be done in this field.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

in the meditation on Ps. 4 in *Confessions* IX.4.8-11. A preoccupation with the Manicheans permeates the passage, both in terms of implicit references to issues important in Augustine's debate with them and in terms of explicit remarks. The hypotheses to be examined in this article, are the following: the Manicheans are signified as the most important (if not sole) intended audience of the passage;[4] Augustine is here not "renounc[ing] his former coreligionists"[5] but appealing to them in a strongly protreptic passage to turn away from their erroneous ways.[6]

Two factors pointed out by O'Donnell add significance to any effort to understand this passage. First, IX.4 is situated very near to the exact midpoint of the *Confessions*. Second, the structure of Ps. 4, which governs the structure of this passage, mirrors the structure of the *Confessions* as a whole.[7] A fuller examination of these aspects falls outside the scope of the present article. The main emphasis here is on the following points: 1) explicit references to the intended audience; 2) devices used to persuade the Manicheans, namely a) identification with the audience and b) the employment of terminology derived from Manichean texts and liturgy. It is of course not always possible to keep these categories apart and discussions often overlap.

The Manicheans as readers of the Confessions and of the Old Testament

At this point there are two issues that have to be considered. First, can we assume that the Manicheans would read the *Confessions*? Courcelle seems to believe that they did and that Secundinus, a prominent Manichean *audi-*

---

[4] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 98 (above n. 1) also refers to the Manicheans as "the express targets of the exegesis."

[5] Van Oort uses this phrase to describe other passages in the *Confessions*, Van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism 245 (above n. 1).

[6] Erich Feldmann, Confessiones. In *Augustinus-Lexicon*, eds. C. Mayer *et al.* (Basel 1994) 1134-1193, holds the view that the *Confessions* as a whole is a protreptikos, "in der A. seine Biographie instrumentalisiert, um mit ihr die Leser aufzuwecken," 1167. The degree to which the form and content of the *Confessions* display characteristics of the προτρεπτικὸς λόγος, is a question which needs further investigation. For the present purposes Berger's summary of the contents of Clemens of Alexandria's Protreptikos illustrates the way in which the term protreptic is used here: "Hier geht es um die Darstellung der Vortrefflichkeit der christlichen Religion gegenüber anderen Wegen: Die christliche Kirche bringt die Wahrheit, die anderen dagegen leere Mythen, Irrtum und Verderben. Der christliche Weg wird als der wahre vorgestellt," Klaus Berger, Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II*, 25.2 (Berlin 1984).

[7] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. 3 91 (above n. 1).

tor, alludes to the *Confessions* in a letter to Augustine.[8] I argue however, that the strongest evidence for this possibility is internal evidence.

Then there is a problem surrounding Augustine's use of an Old Testament text to base a protreptic to the Manicheans on, while we know that they rejected the entire Old Testament (together with parts of the New Testament).[9] But if Augustine can illustrate that the meaning and the message of the psalm is echoed and reinforced by quotations from the New Testament, especially from books we know that the Manicheans were fond of quoting themselves, its message should appear more valid, even to them. Where in *Confessions* IX.4.8 the quotations are from the Psalms (Ps. 4 and other psalms), in the next three sections, that bear the weight of the argument, quotations from the New Testament (and especially from the books of Paul, "the apostle of the Manichees"[10]) abound. It is also significant for our evaluation of the importance of this passage for our reading of the *Confessions* as a whole, to note the dense texture created here by the abundance of scriptural quotations. This is an instance of what Knauer refers to as *Zitatennester*, a phenomenon which he asserts occurs at important or pivotal passages in the *Confessions*.[11]

The Manicheans as the intended audience of Augustine's meditation on Psalm 4

Augustine's remarks here make it impossible to misread the fact that he intended the Manicheans as the most important secondary audience for his meditations on Ps. 4, which are of course formally addressed to God. IX.4.8 quotes Ps. 4:2 and is a kind of prologue with the main function of

---

[8] Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin* (Paris 1968) 236-237.

[9] In IX.4.11 there is an explicit reference to the Manicheans' resistance to (large parts of) Scripture: *super inimicis scripturae huius tabescebam* (The context makes clear that they are the enemies referred to). On the Manicheans' use of Scripture, see also e.g. Van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme 281 (above n. 1); C. P. Bammel, Pauline exegesis, Manicheism and philosophy in the early Augustine. In *Christian faith and Greek philosophy in late antiquity. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1993) 1-25; G. Wenning, Der Einfluss des Manichäismus und des Ambrosius auf die Hermeneutik Augustins, *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 36 (1990) 80-89; Alberto Viciano, Aspects christologiques du "Corpus Paulinum" dans la Controverse antimanichéenne de Saint Augustin, in *Manichean Studies* I (1991) 379-389 and Ries, La Bible chez saint Augustin (above n. 3). O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 1 xlix (above n. 1), also asserts "Everything exegetical in A. down to 400 at least must be taken as having an anti-Manichean sub-text."

[10] Bammel, "Pauline exegesis," 1 (above n. 9).

[11] G. N. Knauer, *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen* (Göttingen 1955) 114-117. He does not analyse *Confessions* IX.4.8-11 in any depth.

setting up the dramatic situation and indicating the intended audience.[12] After stating that he would want the whole world to hear him recite the psalm, Augustine's focus narrows down to the Manicheans: *quam vehementi et acri dolore indignabar manichaeis*,[13] which is translated by Chadwick as "What vehement and bitter anger I felt against the Manichees!"[14] Read like this, there is no trace of the positive emotion towards the Manicheans that I have mentioned. It is difficult to give a better rendition of this sentence but an examination of the Latin should verify that this translation over emphasizes the element of anger while the idea of pain and sorrow, inherent in *vehementi et acri dolore*, is not given enough prominence.

This view is validated by the references to pity, sickness and healing in the following phrases: *miserabar eos rursus, quod illa sacramenta, illa medicamenta nescirent et insani*[15] *essent adversus antidotum quo sani esse potuissent!* ("Also, I pitied them because they did not know those sacraments, those medicines. And they raged insanely against the antidote through which they could have become sane").[16] The imagery of the healer caring for sick or injured humanity was well known to the Manicheans. It is developed extensively in one of their Bêma-psalms,[17] and might have held mostly positive connotations for them.[18] Again, this makes the tone urgent and caring rather than sharp or accusatory.[19]

---

[12] See the analysis of the structure of the Psalm (in which he sees a reflection of the structure of the *Confessions* as a whole) by O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. 3 91 (above n. 1).

[13] All citations are from O'Donnell's text in *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. 1 (above n. 1).

[14] *Saint Augustine. Confessions*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Henry Chadwick (Oxford 1991) 160.

[15] References to madness have become synonymous with the Manicheans in *Confessions* I-VIII and the tone is usually derogatory. But in this context (with its references to the opposite *sani* and to *antidotum*) the emphasis is on sickness and the need for healing.

[16] The translations given here are my own, a "working translation," designed only to meet the needs of the present article. I acknowledge, however, my debt to all translations that I have read.

[17] Bêma Psalm 241, discussed by Julien Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 22 (1976) 218-233, 226.

[18] Of course Augustine's usual negative use of *insani* is also evoked here (playing on the name of Mani/Manes, which meant demented, Van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 9 (above n. 3)).

[19] Gibb and Montgomery's introduction (xxxii-xxxiii) also refers to "a gentleness and an elevation, rare in the theological controversies of Christian antiquity," which is at times discernible in Augustine's language because '[h]e felt that having been himself a member of the sect, it became him to deal tenderly with those who had gone astray

The following lines of IX.4.8 are the most explicit indication that Augustine wants specifically the Manicheans to know how Ps. 4 affected him, and ultimately how it should affect them: *vellem ut alicubi iuxta essent tunc et, me nesciente quod ibi essent, intuerentur faciem meam et audirent voces meas, quando legi quartum psalmum . . . quid de me fecerit ille psalmus* ("I would have liked them to have been somewhere nearby then and to have observed my face and heard my cries when I read that fourth psalm, without me knowing that they were there, and to have seen what effect that psalm had on me"). The subject of *essent* can only be the same as that of the main verbs of the last part of the previous sentence, the Manicheans. It is the Manicheans Augustine wishes could be listening and looking on and not any other group or even the whole world as a cursory glance at the beginning of the passage might have seemed to indicate. Moreover, he assumes that if they could in some way hear and see his emotional reaction without him knowing that they were there, they would be convinced of the sincerity of his emotions and not assume that he is staging an act for their benefit: *ne me propter se illa dicere putarent quae inter haec verba dixerim* ("so that they would not think that I was saying the words I said in between the words of the psalm for their sake"). Why would Augustine wish this if not in the hope that his reactions would touch the Manicheans in a manner that he has been unable to achieve up to now and make them turn away from their wrong way and towards his right way? If this is so the function of the passage can be characterized as protreptic.

The last section of IX.4.8 contains the quotation of the first words of the psalm[20] and sets up an interesting dramatic situation for the meditation that follows. Augustine's words here are, like the rest of the *Confessions*, addressed to God and at least formally presented as a private conversation without an audience. The Manicheans are not present at Cassiciacum as he would have wished them to be. So, the reactions portrayed are to be taken as just as genuine as they would be in such an intimate situation: Augustine alone before his God (as is expressed poignantly by the vocative, *pater*, at the beginning of IX.4.9). Thus, the problems of inhibi-

---

after the same fashion," John Gibb and William Montgomery eds., *The Confessions of Augustine* (Cambridge 1927).

[20] I will refer to this procedure as quotation although very often it is more a question of Augustine intertwining the words of the psalm into his own stream of consciousness, e.g. by changing verbs to the first person to pertain to himself or by changing imperatives to past tense indicatives to indicate how the psalm has had its effect on him. See O'Donnell *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. I lxi (above n. 1).

tions on both sides no longer exist: *re vera nec ea dicerem nec sic ea dicerem, si me ab eis audiri viderique sentirem, nec, si dicerem, sic acciperent, quomodo mecum et mihi coram te de familiari affectu animi mei* ("And it is true that I would not have said those things and would not have said them in the same way, if I had known that I was heard and seen by them. And if I had said them, they would not have accepted them in the way I meant them when I was speaking by myself and to myself in your presence and motivated by the intimate love for you in my heart").

We are then supposed to assume that the opposite applies: the (Manichean) reader "sees" and "hears" Augustine's uninhibited reactions, not an act designed with the ulterior motive of influencing him or her. This also means that, should a Manichean now read the *Confessions*, he must be affected by this passage in just the way Augustine had hoped he would be if his presence that day had gone undetected. This would of course meet exactly the ultimate objective of the master of rhetoric and is another argument for claiming that the passage has a protreptic intent.

Apart from the lines discussed above, there are two more explicit references to the intended audience of the meditation. The first is midway through, at the end of IX.4.9: *quae utinam audissent qui adhuc usque diligunt vanitatem et quaerunt mendacium*: ("Oh, if only they could have heard me, they who still up to this day love emptiness and seek lies"). The reader knows that the group consistently associated with emptiness and lies up to this point in the *Confessions* are the Manicheans.

The next and last (almost) explicit reference to the intended audience of Augustine's exegesis of Ps. 4 calls them deaf corpses and enemies of Scripture. But the context once again softens the impact of these accusations because Augustine says in IX.4.11, *legebam, et ardebam nec inveniebam quid facerem surdis mortuis ex quibus fueram* ("I was reading and I was burning but I could not find anything I could do about these deaf corpses of whom I had been one"[21]). What he wants to communicate here is not invective against the Manicheans but the urgency of his effort to reach them and his utmost frustration with the lack of success up to now.[22] The

[21] I borrowed the translation "deaf corpses" from Pine-Coffin because I cannot translate the phrase any better, *Saint Augustine: Confessions*. Translated with an introduction by R. S. Pine-Coffin (London 1961).

[22] See Chidester's remarks in The symmetry of word and light (above n. 1) on the themes of deafness and blindness that are developed throughout the *Confessions* and are presented *inter alia* as the symptoms Augustine had to be healed from before he could be converted.

last main clause expresses again how strongly the Manicheans' attitude influences Augustine emotionally, almost physically even: *et super inimicis scripturae huius tabescebam* ("and [now] I was feeling sick over the enemies of Scripture").

What was it that the Manicheans would have heard and seen, if they had been present? Although O'Donnell hesitates to deduce that Augustine's remarks here imply reading aloud,[23] I think the dramatic situation requires that he recite the words of the psalm out loud. Or, it would be more correct to say that he interspersed his reading of the psalm with his thoughts on the text, incorporating the words from Scripture with his own.[24] But apart from this there are numerous references to emotional cries and changes to Augustine's outward appearance in the passage.[25]

It is clear already that Augustine's intended audience here are very specifically people still adhering to Manichean doctrines, but also that simply to describe the passage as anti-Manichean would fall short of the truth. The attack on Manichean doctrine here takes secondary importance. The choice of words and the tone of the passage show that the main emphasis is on the concerned effort of a friend who cares deeply for the people he is trying to turn towards the right path. If Brown's remarks on the importance of friendship for Augustine are true, there may well have been many that were adherents of the enemy doctrine but nevertheless still Augustine's friends. He might in fact have felt responsible for them because he himself had led many of them into Manicheism.[26]

But the Manicheans are also the intended audience of Ps. 4. One of the most striking features of Augustine's meditation on this psalm is that he "discovers" there that the prophet (i.e. David) is specifically addressing the Manicheans (which is different from Augustine addressing them). When

---

[23] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 94 (above n. 1). It is interesting to note that Margaret R. Miles, *Desire and Delight. A new Reading of Augustine's Confessions* (New York 1992) 127 assumes this passage to represent "silent, private reading," while Stock, *Augustine the Reader* 112 (above n. 2), remarks on "his description of oral reading at 9.2-9.4.19."

[24] Knauer, *Psalmenzitate*, (above n. 11) remains the most coherent and full treatment of Augustine's varied techniques of citing (the psalms) from scripture.

[25] The references to his facial expression and his cries in IX.4.8, have already been mentioned. There are also in IX.4.8 *Quas . . . voces* (twice); in IX.4.9 *haec omnia exibant per oculos et vocem meam* and *insonui multa graviter ac fortiter* and in IX.4.11 *clamabam in consequenti versu clamore alto cordis mei.*

[26] In his chapter on friends Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London 1967) 61 speaks about the "core of abiding friendships" that included many fellow-students who had followed Augustine into Manicheism.

he says in IX.4.9 *talibus dicitur qualem me fuisse reminiscebar* ("It was addressed to the kind of people of whom I remembered that I had been one"), it is clear that these people can, in the context, only be the Manicheans. The power and dramatic quality of these words become clear when they are read in the context:

> *et clamat prophetia, 'quousque graves corde? ut quid diligitis vanitatem et quaeritis mendacium? et scitote quoniam dominus magnificavit sanctum suum.' clamat 'quousque', clamat 'scitote', et ego tamdiu nesciens vanitatem dilexi et mendacium quaesivi, et ideo audivi et contremui, quoniam talibus dicitur qualem me fuisse reminiscebar. in phantasmatis enim quae pro veritate tenueram vanitas erat et mendacium.*[27]
>
> And the prophet calls out: 'how long will you harden your hearts? And why do you love emptiness and seek lies? And know that the Lord raised his Holy One to glory.' He calls 'How long?', He calls 'Know!' And for so long I did not know, and I loved emptiness and sought lies. And for this reason I heard these words and I trembled, because it was addressed to the kind of people of whom I remembered that I had been one. For in the fantastic ideas that I had clung to instead of the truth, were the emptiness and the lies.

The use of *quoniam* and *enim* in the second part of this section clearly indicates how Augustine interprets the words of the psalm as pertaining directly to the kind of errors he has associated with Manichean doctrine up to this point in the *Confessions*. The last sentence explicitly underscores this: the emptiness and lies the prophet talks about in Ps. 4 equal (Manichean) *phantasmata*.[28]

Apart from addressing the Manicheans by name and using a non-confrontational tone, there are two other important devices Augustine employs to try to convince them. Firstly, the passage seems to contain a sustained or at least a recurrent *captatio benevolentiae*, where Augustine identifies with his audience, and secondly he makes repeated use of Manichean vocabulary.[29]

---

[27] Lines 11-17 of IX.4.9 in O'Donnell's text.

[28] In *Conf.* III.6 (where Augustine's falling in with the Manicheans is described and where *phantasmata* or *phantasmatis* occurs four times) the word *phantasmata* stands for Manichean doctrine, more than any other single word or concept.

[29] See also Van Oort's remarks on this occurrence, Manichaeism and anti-Manichaeism 243 (above n. 1).

Devices used to reach out to the Manicheans

Identification with the audience

We have seen that Augustine has more than once expressed his concern, his sympathy, his urgency to reach the Manicheans. We have already referred to his use of the image of the healer caring for the sick and the serious effort expressed in the phrase *surdis mortuis*, used near the end of the meditation.

He also repeatedly identifies with his audience, castigating himself for the mistakes he has made i.e. the mistakes they are still making. In IX.4.9 for example Augustine hammers on *vanitatem et mendacium*, terms closely associated with Manichean error in the preceding books of the *Confessions*. But the intent of the passage is not invective. It is presented as a personal confession of sins: *dilexeram enim vanitatem et quaesieram mendacium . . . vanitatem dilexi et mendacium quaesivi et ideo audivi et contremui* ("For I had loved emptiness and sought lies . . . I have loved emptiness and sought lies and therefore I heard these words and I trembled"). Did Augustine tremble at the realization of how nearly he himself had been lost, or is his apprehension yet another sign of an emotional preoccupation with the wellbeing of the Manicheans?

At the end of IX.4.9 Augustine again identifies with his audience. It is phrased as a wish: *quae utinam audissent qui adhuc usque diligunt vanitatem et quaerunt mendacium* ("Oh, if only they could have heard me, they who still up to this day love emptiness and seek lies"). The key word is *usque*: The Manicheans still love emptiness and lies, but Augustine himself knows exactly what this feels like. The wish is followed by a postulation of what Augustine believes would have happened if the Manicheans had witnessed his meditation: *forte . . . evomuissent illud, et exaudires eos cum clamarent ad te* ("Perhaps they would have become upset and spewed out these lies, and You would have answered them when they called to You"). The words derive an added dimension in the light of Augustine's dramatic description of himself doing precisely this in the preceding book of the *Confessions*.

Augustine ends the meditation on Ps. 4 with a last identification with his audience in IX.4.11, *nec inveniebam quid facerem surdis mortuis ex quibus fueram* ("I could not find anything I could do about these deaf corpses of whom I had been one"). Although their attitude towards Scripture now makes him sick, he takes upon himself the shame for what he is accusing them of, *(ego) pestis latrator amarus et caecus adversus litteras* ("I had been a pestilence, barking bitterly and blindly against Scripture").

Manichean terminology

The next aspect to be examined is the striking degree to which Augustine uses Manichean terminology and the frame of reference of Manichean religious practice in order to penetrate their defenses. I will treat at some length the references to the Holy Spirit in IX.4.9 and the discussion of sin and repentance in IX.4.10. This is followed by a some remarks on Augustine's use of *lumen*, culinary imagery, phrases of calling and answering and *superbia* in IX.4.8-11.

In IX.4.9 *paracletum, spiritum veritatis* ("the paraclete, the spirit of truth") is the most important "Manichean category" used. The Manicheans saw Mani as the paraclete promised by Jesus, and the phrase "Mani, the paraclete, spirit of Truth" occurs frequently in their liturgical texts.[30] They also emphasized a trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit and although this differed radically from the Christian doctrine of the trinity, they went so far as to exploit the (superficial) similarity in a deliberately propagandistic way in an effort to win over other Christians to their sect.[31]

It is significant that this is one of the few places outside his anti-Manichean works where Augustine uses the term *paracletus*, which he usually avoided *inter alia* because it was, according to O'Donnell, loaded with Manichean "claims and practices."[32] This confirms my thesis that Augustine is here consciously using loaded terms, phrases familiar to the Manicheans, perhaps because they might arrest their attention or for the benefits they might offer in terms of terminological clarity.

Here the phrase *paracletum, spiritum veritatis* occurs in a section where Augustine describes how he found in the psalm (Ps. 4:3) the words he has already used throughout the *Confessions* to describe the errors of Manichean ways:[33] *vanitatem et mendacium*.[34] These words have also been associated consistently with his own previous inability, under influence of Manichean doc-

---

[30] François E. Decret, Le problème du Saint Esprit dans le système manichéen, *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993) 267-273, at 271.

[31] Decret, Le problème du Saint Esprit 268 (above n. 30).

[32] O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 97 (above n. 1): "A. uses paracletus rarely outside his anti-Manichean works . . . first, because it probably did not appear in his NT translations . . . and second, to avoid a word complicated by Manichean claims and practice . . ."

[33] This is what he implies. The possibility exists however that the discovery of these terms in the psalm predates his use of them in the *Confessions*.

[34] The text of the psalm used here is O'Donnell's very useful reconstruction, *Augustine: Confessions* vol. 3 91-92 (above n. 1).

trine, to conceive of God as a spiritual being. The two-word combination is repeated no less than six times (only once changed into the nominative) in the course of IX.4.9 both before and after the phrase *paracletum, spiritum veritatis*. It is clear that Augustine sees the solution to the problem of *vanitatem et mendacium* as connected with the "Spirit of Truth."

In Psalm 4 the reference to *vanitatem et mendacium* (in verse 3) is followed by the words *et scitote quoniam magnificavit dominus sanctum suum* ("and know that the Lord has raised up his Holy One") in verse 4. This seems to evoke for Augustine the "correct" conception of what Christ was and by implication the solution to the problem of believing in emptiness and lies. He explains that he had believed in emptiness and lies because he had not known that God had done three important and related things: He had raised Christ from the dead, He had put him at his right hand and Christ had sent the Holy Spirit. The three points are not present in this form in the psalm but are evoked for Augustine by the words of verse 4 *et scitote quoniam magnificavit dominus sanctum suum*. These words he incorporates into his own, followed by the three points as an interpretative elaboration: *et tu, domine, iam magnificaveras sanctum tuum, (1) suscitans eum a mortuis et (2) collocans ad dexteram tuam, (3) unde mitteret ex alto promissionem suam, paracletum, spiritum veritatis* ("And you, o Lord, had already raised up your Holy One, (1) by raising Him from the dead and (2) placing Him at your right hand. (3) And thence, from on high he sent him he had promised, the paraclete, the spirit of truth").

What we have here are the main differences between the Christology of Catholic doctrine and that of the Manicheans.[35] Especially the emphasis on Christ's death and resurrection is meant to speak directly to the Manicheans who did not believe in the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ. This point is again present at the end of IX.4.9: *quoniam vera morte carnis mortuus est pro nobis* ("because he died the true death of the flesh for us"). It is clear that also this part of Augustine's interpretation of Ps. 4 has relevance for the dialogue between him and the Manicheans.

The next verse of the psalm (verse 5) is treated at the beginning of IX.4.10. Its reference to repentance over sin, *irascimini et nolite peccare ... et ... compungimini* ("be angry and do not sin ... and ... be stung [by remorse]") offers Augustine the platform to the next set of Manichean

[35] For more information on the Christology of both Augustine and the Manicheans, see for example Viciano, Aspects christologiques du 'Corpus Paulinum' (above n. 9) or Van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme (above n. 1).

terms and other important issue over which he has had to think his way out of Manichean doctrine (in Book VII) before he could finally be converted. The individual himself was responsible for the sins he committed and not some other power over which he had no control:

> *iam didiceram irasci mihi de praeteritis, ut de cetero non peccarem, et merito irasci, quia non alia natura gentis tenebrarum de me peccabat, sicut dicunt qui sibi non irascuntur et thesaurizant sibi iram in die irae et revelationis iusti iudicii tui!*
>
> (I had already learnt to be angry at myself over my sins of the past, so that I would sin no more. And I was angry deservedly, because it was not some other nature from the race of darkness that sinned in me, as those say who are not angry over their sins [deservedly] and they are storing up anger against themselves on the day of anger and of the revelation of your true judgement.)

He urges the Manicheans to repent and confess their sins and even insinuates that because of their refusal to repent, they will be punished on the day of final judgement.[36] Near the end of this section Augustine wishes that the Manicheans might ask him what to do to be saved, *quis ostendet nobis bona?* ("Who will show us where our salvation lies?")[37] and emphasizes, as if in answer, his own repentance and exchange of his old sinful nature for the new.[38]

> *si afferent ad me cor in oculis suis foris a te et dicerent, 'quis ostendet nobis bona?' ibi enim ubi mihi iratus eram, intus in cubili ubi compunctus eram, ubi sacrificaveram mactans vetustatem meam in inchoata meditatione renovationis meae ibi mihi dulcescere coeperas et dederas laetitiam in corde meo.*
>
> (If only they would turn their hearts to me through their eyes that were outside of you, and would say 'Who will show us where our salvation lies?' For there where I was angry with myself, inside in my inner room, where I felt remorse, where I had sacrificed, slaying my old self and where I started the meditation that was to cause my renewal, there You had started to be sweet to me and You had given me joy in my heart.)

---

[36] The final day of reckoning was a concept familiar to the Manicheans. See Ries, La fête de Bêma 226 (above n. 17).

[37] Modern interpreters find this verse of the psalm problematic, but Augustine's interpretation in his *Ennarationes in Psalmos* seems to me to justify my translation here.

[38] This is another concept familiar to the Manicheans, based on their reading of Paul: "Faustus' understanding of anthropology and of conversion is illuminated by Pauline verses which contrast the old man and the new man." Bammel, Pauline exegesis 6 (above n. 9).

What gives this passage added significance is the fact that Augustine is once again talking to the Manicheans in terms and categories familiar to them. A recognition of the need for forgiveness, repentance and regular confession of sins formed an integral part of Manichean ritual, as is shown clearly in the Ries' article, "La fête de Bêma dans l'Église de Mani".[39] We also know that Augustine would have been thoroughly aware of this fact after his nine years as a practicing *auditor* with the Manicheans.[40] How can he then accuse the Manicheans of a lack of confession and repentance? I think that a key might lie in Augustine's interpretation of *irascimini*[41] and in the word *merito* and the phrase following it in the first sentence of IX.4.10. Augustine seems to imply that real repentance depends firstly on a real anger at yourself for your own responsibility in sinning. Secondly it depends on a true conception of what evil is, the question whose Manichean answer had drawn him to them initially but which he has since learnt to answer differently. When he says *merito irasci, quia non alia natura gentis tenebrarum de me peccabat, sicut dicunt qui sibi non irascuntur*, he makes a direct link between confessing and the confessor's concept of evil.

The debate surrounding the *unde malum* question was one of the most essential differences between Augustine and the Manicheans, and one that has been prominent in the preceding narrative of the *Confessions*. The way Augustine interprets Ps. 4, makes repentance and confession and thus by implication the question about evil, one of its central points. In Augustine's eyes the psalm addresses perhaps the two most important issues in Manichean doctrine that he finds unacceptable: their Christology and their beliefs about evil.[42]

The other aspect of chapter 10 that I want to look at briefly is its references to light. For Agustine the word *lumen* in verse 7 of the psalm,

---

[39] Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani 223-226 and 229-230 (above n. 17).

[40] See Van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme 278 (above n. 1) and *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 41-45 (above n. 3).

[41] That this word (as well as its form, imperative) is problematic, becomes clear when it is compared to the Hebrew original and when different translations and commentaries on this verse of the psalm are taken into account. It is clear, however, that Augustine interprets it almost literally in the repetitions of the word in the rest of IX.4.10. This also allows him the word play in *qui sibi non irascuntur et thesaurizant sibi iram in die irae.*

[42] See e.g. Robert A. Markus, Augustine's *Confessions* and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manicheism revisited, *Mélanges T. J. van Bavel. Augustiniana* 40-41, vol. 2 (1990) 913-925. He see Augustine's rejection of the Manichean explanation of evil as the most important step in his break with Manicheism.

signatum est in nobis lumen vultus tui, domine ("the light of your face is imprinted in us, o Lord") is heavy with the meanings associated with it in previous parts of the *Confessions* as well as with Manichean connotations.[43] It is still a part of the answer of the question about the nature of evil, of the universe and of God. The terms *lumen/tenebrae* played a prominent role in the dualistic cosmology to the Manicheans who postulated two primary realms, one of light and the other of darkness.[44] They also believed that the souls of both humans and animals consisted of light particles that derived from the substance of God himself.

Augustine's interpretation of these words of Ps. 4 in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* is in general terms,[45] but his explanation in *Conf.* IX.4.10 is yet another feature of this meditation designed explicitly to speak to the Manicheans, *non enim lumen nos sumus quod inluminat omnem hominem, sed inluminamur a te ut, qui fuimus aliquando tenebrae, simus lux in te.* ("For we are not the light which illuminates all men, but we are illuminated by You, so that we who were darkness before, can become light in You").[46]

It is also interesting to note in passing how Augustine combines here the culinary imagery used throughout the *Confessions* with Manichean terminology. It is conceivable that the Manichean doctrine surrounding food and eating was subconsciously (or perhaps even deliberately) influencing Augustine's use of imagery here. The Manicheans believed that the eating habits of their elite helped in the process of liberating light particles from the matter in which it has become imprisoned: they abstained from meat and wine and ate only vegetable foods which were believed to contain light particles.[47] Here Augustine speaks about the Manicheans licking

---

[43] See Chidester, The symmetry of word and light, especially 120 and 126-129 (above n. 1). It is also interesting to note that the book with the most references to *lux* or *lumen* (7 occurrences) is Book 7 where conceptual differences with the Manicheans is hammered out intensively.

[44] For a clear and concise account of the complicated Manichean myth, see Van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 16-29 (above n. 3).

[45] In *Enarrationes in Psalmos* he gives an allegorical explanation: *hoc lumen est totum hominis et verum bonum, quod non oculis sed mente conspicitur. 'signatum' autem dixit 'in nobis', tamquam denarius signatur regis imagine.*

[46] Chidester, The symmetry of word and light (above n. 1) is especially illuminating on the differences between the Manicheans and Augustine as far as the exact status and role of light in their religions are concerned. Augustine's words here are also a repetition of the main ideas he has already expressed in *Conf.* VIII. 10.22, where he addresses the Manicheans in a direct protreptic statement: *attendite, quid dicatis, et erubescite et accedite ad eum et illuminamini.*

[47] Gibb and Montgomery, *The Confessions of Augustine* xxvii (above n. 19).

visual images that did not satisfy their hunger, *imagines eorum famelica cogitatione lambiunt*[48] ("they lick the images of temporal things and their thoughts remain hungry"); not eating (certain foods), *o si fatigentur inedia* ("oh, if only they would become tired of fasting"); about having tasted eternity inside himself, *o si viderent internum aeternum, quod ego . . . gustaveram* ("oh, if only they could see the eternity within me, that I . . . had tasted"); and he speaks about not wanting to devour or be devoured by transient temporal things, *devorans tempora et devoratus temporibus*, ("devouring the temporal and being devoured by the temporal") while he had the real food of God's word at his disposal, *cum haberem . . . aliud frumentum et vinum et oleum* ("although I had . . . other corn and wine and oil").

Less obvious, but certainly present throughout this passage there is also the Manichean terminology surrounding the *tochme-sotme* pair, referring to calling and answering.[49] When the central position of *tochme-sotme* within Manichean song and liturgy is taken into account, it seems improbable that Augustine's references to calling and answering in *Conf.* IX.4.8-11 (and perhaps in the rest of the *Confessions*) are accidental. In IX.4.8 Ps. 4:1 is quoted: *cum invocarem, exaudivit me deus iustitiae meae* ("When I called, the God of my righteousness answered me"). In IX.4.9 he tries to convince the Manicheans that the psalm is calling to them personally and assures them of God's welcoming reaction *clamat prophetia . . . clamat quousque, clamat scitote* ("the prophet calls out . . . he calls out 'how long still?' and he calls out 'know'") and *et exaudires eos, cum clamarent ad te* ("and You will answer them when they call out to You").

The last aspect to be looked at is the use of terminology concerning the concept *superbia*. Chidester proposes a convincing argument for seeing Augustine's presentation of his conversion as a conversion from pride to humility. We know that in the *Confessions* the Manicheans are consistently accused of pride. Augustine seems to summarize the effect or purpose of Ps. 4 as "an antidote against pride." In the chapter immediately preceding the meditation there are references to *superbia* and the contrast between (proud) cedars and (humble) herbs, and also the use of the verbs *perdomueris* ("You tamed") and *subegeris* ("You subjected"). The first mention of the psalms of David in IX.4.8 is in terms of their resistance to pride:

---

[48] This is a reference to Plotinus, according to Chadwick, *Augustine. Confessions* 161 (above n. 14).

[49] Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani 224-225 (above n. 17). Van Oort also believes that the emphasis on "God's *clamare* and his *vox* and *vocatio*" in the *Confessions* must be "compared with the pivotal role of the Manichaean Call and Answer," *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine* 52 (above n. 3).

psalmos David, cantica fidelia, sonos pietatis excludentes turgidum spiritum ("the psalms of David, songs of faith, sounds of piety, that shut out an inflated spirit".) A few lines further Augustine indicates that he would like to recite Ps. 4 to the whole of humanity, *adversus typhum generis humani* ("against the pride of the human race"). It is clear that, even though this is not obvious from a superficial reading, he sees Ps. 4 as a strong warning against pride and thus also in this respect addressing a central Manichean weakness.

Augustine's conclusion to the meditation

All that remains is to take a quick look at the last section of the meditation.[50] IX.4.11 is an exegesis of the two final verses of the psalm: *in pace, in idipsum obdormiam et somnum capiam, quoniam tu, domine, singulariter in spe constituisti me* ("May I go to sleep in peace, in God Himself and fall into a deep sleep, because You, O Lord, have created me for your one eternal hope").[51] It has as its main theme the eschatological peace, which is the ultimate goal of the searching soul, as has been foreshadowed in *Conf.* I.1.1, *et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te* ("and our heart is restless, until it finds rest in You") and with which *Conf.* XIII will end, *post illa nos requieturos in tua grandi sanctificatione speramus . . . quoniam tua quies tu ipse es* ("We hope that after this life we will rest in your great sanctification . . . because the rest that comes from You is You yourself").

The climax of the meditation has been reached. Augustine seems fully focussed on God alone, repeating the personal pronoun as though in an invocation: *et tu es idipsum valde, . . . et in te requires . . . nullus alius tecum . . . quod tu, sed tu, domine, . . .* ("And You are Himself ultimately . . . and in You there is rest . . . there is none other besides You . . . because You, but only You, Lord . . ."). These first 7 lines of IX.4.11 would have been a perfectly fitting end to an ecstatic meditation and communication with God.

But it is important to note that Augustine does not end here. The end of the passage on his reading of Ps. 4 is the sentence, referred to above, where he states his despair at being unable to reach the audience he has been speaking to throughout IX.4.8-11, the *surdis mortuis*. His conclusion is a last attempt to turn around his audience, and constitutes a neat fram-

---

[50] A detailed analysis of this section and especially of its relation to book 13 of the *Confessions* is important, but not part of the arguments of the present article.

[51] Once again, my translation is based on Augustine's interpretation of the verse in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and not on modern interpretations.

ing of the meditation on Ps. 4 by explicit references to its intended audience, the Manicheans.

Conclusion

How does the above analysis influence our understanding of the *Confessions* as a whole? First, Augustine is spending a lot of space on the Manicheans here at the midpoint of the *Confessions* (the need to hasten and tell only the most important events has been stressed just before the start of this passage and is implicitly repeated immediately after it). Secondly, the Manicheans are also important at other key points in the *Confessions*. Van Oort's article shows the prominence of Manichean echoes in *Confessions* I.1.1 and throughout books I-III and Joubert believes that they are the primary group Augustine is trying to reach in book XIII.[52] It is clear that it has become imperative to look more closely at the importance of the Manichean perspective in our reading of the whole of the *Confessions*, as Van Oort has emphasized repeatedly. If IX.4.8-11 mirrors the structure of the *Confessions* as a whole (as O'Donnell points out) and this passage is clearly protreptic in function, then Feldmann's thesis that the *Confessions* belong to the genre of the protreptic deserves more attention than it has received up to now.

Annemaré Kotzé (University of Stellenbosch, South Africa)

LIST OF QUOTED WORKS IN ORDER OF FIRST QUOTATION

1. Johannes van Oort, Manicheism and anti-Manicheism in Augustine's *Confessiones*, *Manichaean Studies III, Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico"* (1997) 235-247.
2. Johannes van Oort, Augustinus en het manicheïsme, *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 47 (1993) 276-291.
3. D. Chidester, The symmetry of word and light: perceptual categories in Augustine's Confessions, *Augustinian Studies* 17 (1986) 119-133.
4. James J. O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1992).

---

[52] Van Oort, Manichaeism and anti-Manichaeism (above n. 1) and Catherine Joubert, Le livre XIII et la structure des Confessions de Saint Augustine, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 66 (1992) 77-117. I wish to thank Prof. Johannes van Oort for the conversations at Stellenbosch during 1998 and the material he subsequently put to my disposal.

5. Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1996).
6. Julien Ries, La Bible chez saint Augustin et chez les manichéens, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 9 (1963) 201-215.
7. Johannes van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism and Its Influence on Western Christianity* (Tbilisi 1996).
8. Erich Feldmann, Confessiones, in *Augustinus-Lexicon*, eds. C. Mayer et al. (Basel 1994) 1134-1193.
9. Klaus Berger, Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II*, 25.2 (Berlin 1984) 1031-1432.
10. Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustine* (Paris 1968).
11. C. P. Bammel, Pauline exegesis, Manicheism and philosophy in the early Augustine. In *Christian faith and Greek philosophy in late antiquity. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1993) 1-25.
12. G. Wenning, Der Einfluss des Manichäismus und des Ambrosius auf die Hermeneutik Augustins, *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 36 (1990) 80-89.
13. Alberto Viciano, Aspects christologiques du "Corpus Paulinum" dans la Controverse antimanichéene de Saint Augustin. In *Manichean Studies I* (1991) 379-389.
14. G. N. Knauer, *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen* (Göttingen 1955).
15. *Saint Augustine. Confessions.* Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Henry Chadwick (Oxford 1991).
16. Julien Ries, La fête de Bêma dans l'Eglise de Mani, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 22 (1976) 218-233.
17. John Gibb and William Montgomery eds., *The Confessions of Augustine* (Cambridge 1927).
18. *Saint Augustine. Confessions.* Translated with an introduction by R. S. Pine-Coffin (London 1961).
19. Margaret R. Miles, *Desire and Delight. A new Reading of Augustine's Confessions* (New York 1992).
20. Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London 1967).
21. François E. Decret, Le problème du Saint Esprit dans le système manichéen, *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993) 267-273.
22. Robert A. Markus, Augustine's *Confessions* and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manicheism revisited, *Mélanges T. J. van Bavel, Augustiniana* 40-41, vol. 2 (1990) 913-925.
23. Catherine, Joubert, Le livre XIII et la structure des Confessions de Saint Augustin, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 66 (1992) 77-117.

PSALMUS GRATIAE DEI: AUGUSTINE'S "PAULINE" READING OF *PSALM 31*[1]

BY

THOMAS F. MARTIN, O.S.A.

ABSTRACT: A study of Augustine's application of a Pauline lens to his reading of *Psalm* 31, enabling him to conclude that it is a psalm of grace and justification. Such an approach highlights both the unique and original reading of the psalms carried out by Augustine as well as the profound impact the Apostle Paul had upon his biblical and theological endeavors.

On at least two occasions, by now secure in his reputation as eminent biblical scholar, Jerome the *presbyter* made it perfectly clear to the Augustine still novice-bishop that he considered the North African's approach to the psalms unconventional. He tells Augustine, regarding:

> . . . certain commentaries on the Psalms, that if I [Jerome] so wished to discuss them, I would indicate that they were at variance (*discrepare*), not with my interpretation, I who am nobody, but with that of the venerable Greeks.[2]

Jerome is writing in 403 or 404. He proceeds politely (*nihil sum*: he is a presbyter, Augustine a bishop) yet pointedly to insist that he finds in Augustine's work a *discrepatio*—his commentary on the Psalms "disagrees," "clashes" with what Jerome states is the "the venerable Greek tradition." He does not specify the exact nature of the *discrepatio* and in response, Augustine the fledgling bishop only addresses the matter of their specific disagreement "*de illis uerbis Apostoli ad Galatas*," the well-known and much discussed dispute concerning the historicity of *Gal.* 2:11. He says nothing

---

[1] A draft of this study was originally presented as a Master Theme at the *Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Oxford, 16-21 August 1999.

[2] "*. . . et quosdam Commentarios in Psalmos quos si uellem discutere, non dicam a me, quod nihil sum, sed a ueterum Graecorum docerem interpretationibus discrepare.*" Hieronymus, *ep.* 105.5 (Aug.: *ep.* 72.5). Regarding Jerome and the psalms, see Pierre Jay, "Jérôme et la pratique de l'exégèse," in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, Bible de tous les temps, 2 (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985), 523-541.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

to Jerome about his off-handed but seemingly disparaging psalm comment. On a second occasion (404), in Jerome's response to Augustine's *Letter* 73, most of the attention once again focuses upon their dispute concerning *Galatians*. Towards his conclusion Jerome does take up the question of the Psalms, noting that much work has already been done by way of commentary both in the Greek East and the Latin West—with the implicit critique that Augustine's psalm work is, at the very least, superfluous. He notes the works of the Greeks: Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodore of Heraclea, Asterius of Scythopolis, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Didymus of Alexandria, "all who have commented on the whole Psalter."[3] He turns to the Latins noting Hilary of Poitiers and Eusebius of Vercelli who translated Origen and Eusebius, as well as Ambrose who likewise translated Origen and Eusebius. Why, he asks Augustine,

> . . . in the face of so many and so revered interpreters of the Psalms, will you come up with different meanings—*respondeat mihi prudentia tua, quare tu post tantos et tales interpretes in explanatione Psalmorum diuersa senseris?*:[4]

Not only does Jerome gingerly suggest that Augustine's efforts are superfluous but once again he notes that there is something unconventional about Augustine's approach: . . . *diuersa senseris*. What precisely does Jerome intend by this *diuersa senseris*—does it extend beyond their disagreement over the value of the Septuagint in relationship to the Hebrew text? He continues by suggesting that, unlike himself, Augustine is subverting the work of previous commentators.[5] Augustine's next response, his *Letter* 82, is once again

---

[3] ". . . *maxime in explanatione Psalmorum quos apud Graecos interpretati sunt multis uoluminibus, primus Origines, secundus Eusebius Caesariensis, tertius Theodorus Heracleotes, quartus Asterius Scythopolitanus, quintus Apollinaris Laodicenus, sextus Didymus Alexandrinus. Feruntur et diuersorum in paucos psalmos opuscula; sed nunc de integro Psalmorum corpore dicimus. Apud Latinos autem Hilarius Pictauiensis et Eusebius Uercellensis episcopi, Originem et Eusebium transtulerunt: quorum priorem et noster Ambrosius in quibusdam secutus est. Respondeat mihi prudentia tua, quare tu post tantos et tales interpretes in explanatione Psalmorum diuersa senseris?*" *ep.* 73.5. Clearly Jerome notes the "primacy" of Origen in inaugurating the tradition of the psalm commentary. Regarding Jerome and Origen's psalm labors, see Vittorio Peri, *Omelie origeniane sui salmi: Contributo all'identificazione del testo latino*, Studi e testi, 289 (Città del Vaticana: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticano, 1980), but see Jay, 529, n. 25 also idem, "Jérôme à Bethléem: les *Tractatus in psalmos*," in *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient. XVIe centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem.* Actes du Colloque de Chantilly (septembre 1986), publiés par Yves-Marie Duval (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1988), 367-380.

[4] Hieronymus, *ep.* 112.20 (Aug., *ep.* 75).

[5] "*Ego enim non tam uetera abolere conatus sum, quae linguae meae hominibus emendata de graeco in latinum transtuli, quam ea testimonia quae a Iudaeis praetermissa sunt uel corrupta, proferre in*

almost entirely devoted to the *Galatians* question, explored at even greater length. Since Augustine makes no mention of Jerome's charge of *diuersa sentire*, a closer look at Augustine's actual interpretation of the *Psalms* may reveal something further concerning the nature of Jerome's charge against Augustine of *discrepatio* and *diuersitas*, especially in the light of the previous exegetical tradition. In particular, this study will explore Augustine's explicit application of a Pauline hermeneutic to an understanding of the Psalms.

A Question Of Originality

Anyone who has had the opportunity to consider Augustine's entire commentary on the *Psalms* notes immediately both the lushness and artistry that marks the whole project. The striking insight, creative application, minute verbal analysis, and consistent pastoral exhortation often reach heights of eloquence and memorable aphorism. Taken as a whole the *Enarrationes* are so thoroughly marked by Augustine's originality of thought and expression that when placed against the larger patristic Psalm-commentary tradition, especially in the Latin west, its uniqueness is immediately apparent. However, Jerome seems to have been struck by something other than Augustine's creative mind and memorable yet distinctive discourse. The *discrepatio* and *diuersitas* suggest that Jerome discovered something disturbingly deeper and more provocatively singular that made Augustine's approach to the psalms problematic for him.[6]

This originality is perhaps one reason for a fresh interest in Augustine's psalm endeavors, part and parcel of an overall renewed interest in the

---

medium, ut scirent nostri quid hebraea ueritas contineret." ibid. Jay highlights Jerome's "Antiochene" approach to exegesis, which begins with "the letter" or "the history," 531. The thrust of Augustine's engagement with the psalms is clearly elsewhere.

[6] While I intend to highlight the Pauline dimension of Augustine's approach to the psalms, suggesting it as something Jerome would have found disconcerting, the "exegetical" controversies between Augustine and Jerome are certainly much wider. To cite one example, Nauroy notes that Jerome's critique of Augustine's approach reflects a more fundamental "anti-Ambrosian" critique, Gérard Nauroy, "Jérôme, lecteur et censeur de l'exégèse d'Ambroise," in *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient. XVIe centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem.* Actes du Colloque de Chantilly (septembre 1986), publiés par Yves-Marie Duval (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1988), 197; see Carolinne White, *The Correspondence (394-419) Between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo*, Studies in Bible and Early Christianity, vol. 23 (Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990); also Mark Vessey, "*Conference* and *Confession*: Literary Pragmatics in Augustine's *Apologia contra Hieronymum*," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1:2 (1993): 175-213.

Patristic encounter with the scriptures. Surely, the "*Christological—Ecclesiological—Eschatological*" formula of *uox totius Christi* captures well the unique focus that Augustine brought to his overall understanding and approach to the psalms.[7] His application of the hermeneutical, theological, and pastoral lens of the *Christus Totus* enabled him to draw forth from the rich discourse and abundant symbolism of the psalms a reading that made these ancient religious-poetic hymns, both for Augustine and his own congregation, the chants and praises of their very own Christian hearts.[8] These were no longer simply historical texts, precious documents detailing ancient Israel's relationship with God. They were now the songs of present Christian journeying and pilgrimage, present Christian conversion and holiness.[9]

If Jerome was indeed struck by the *diversa sentire* of Augustine's reading of the psalms, perhaps one aspect of this *discrepatio* was its Paulinism. In fledgling form in his initial engagement with the Psalms, with subsequent full blossoming in the course of the Pelagian controvery, Augustine brought to his understanding of the psalms a distinctive Pauline approach. With the Apostle as reading guide, Augustine was able to demonstrate not only

---

[7] This, appropriately, is the title of the recently published and excellent study of Michael Fiedorowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi: Studien zu Augustins "Enarrationes in Psalmos"* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1997). This work is the most up-to-date and comprehensive analysis of Augustine's overall approach to the psalms, with an extensive bibliography on the literature of the *enarrationes*. Regarding the concerns of this study see his considerations of the psalms and grace, 165-175.

[8] Regarding Augustine's notion of *Christus totus* see, Egon Franz, *"Totus Christus" Studien über Christus und die Kirche bei Augustin*, (Bonn: n.p., 1956); Tarsicius J. Van Bavel, O.E.S.A., *Recherches sur la Christologie de saint Augustin: L'humain et le divin dans le Christ d'après saint Augustin*, (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1954); Goulven Madec, *La patrie et la voie: le Christ dans la vie et la pensée de Saint Augustin* (Paris: Desclé, 1989), esp. ch. 6, pt. 5. I would also like to acknowledge the helpful comments of Michael Cameron in his unpublished paper "*Totus Christus* as Hermeneutical Construct in Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*," *The Harp of Prophecy, Early Christian Interpretation of the Psalms*, University of Notre Dame, October 18, 1998.

[9] Clearly the question of the psalms fits into larger early Christian concerns stemming from theological debates regarding the status of the Old Testament for the Christian community. Marcion certainly forced this question. Augustine is likewise profoundly shaped by his Manichaean experience, with their wholesale rejection of the Old Testament, including the Psalms (see *Conf.* IX.4.8-11). Since the almost boisterous singing of the psalms marked the popular and widespread devotion of the Donatists, this too will color Augustine's own approach to them, see F. Van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop: Religion and Society at the Dawn of the Middle Ages*, trans. B. Battershaw and G.R. Lamb (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), 325-337.

the unity between Old and New Testaments, but even prophetic confirmation of the primacy of grace.[10] His two commentaries on *Psalm* 31[11] will shed light upon what was perhaps a disconcerting novelty for some or an analytical breakthrough for others, but in either case reveal what is a distinctively Augustinian approach to the psalms.

The first commentary on *Psalm* 31 dates from the 390's and is reflective of Augustine's first serious attempt to engage systematically the psalms, doing so verse by verse and even word by word. The second is, with all likelihood, to be dated to the opening stages of the Pelagian controversy. While post-dating Jerome's comments, it would have confirmed the judgment of the irascible monk and renowned scripture scholar in Bethlehem that Augustine was indeed about something different.

Augustine and Psalm 31

First some comments regarding Augustine's initial exploration of *Psalm* 31 will be helpful—these early efforts provide a point of comparison and contrast with his own later development. It is readily apparent that his beginning labors with the *psalms* (1-32) are striking in their brevity. For the most part these first *enarrationes* consist of a verse from the psalm followed by a brief sentence or phrase from Augustine. Thus the first *enarratio* on Psalm 31 covers 2 pages and some 60 lines in the *CCSL* edition. (To appreciate the contrast, the second runs for some 23 pages, and totals some 826 lines.)

If the second *enarratio* blatantly proclaims *Psalm* 31 to be a psalm of grace, the early Augustine has already begun to move in this direction. In the Patristic tradition of granting no little attention to the "Title,"[12] Augustine's comments sparked by the Psalm's inscription do indeed suggest future developments. The title reads: "*Ipsi Dauid intelligentiae*—[a Psalm] of David, concerning understanding." Augustine thus begins:

> *Ipsi Dauid intelligentiae, qua intelligitur non meritis operum, sed gratia Dei hominem liberari, confitentem peccata sua.*[13]

---

[10] The "Pauline lens" to be explored here is clearly one aspect of a pervasive and complex Paulinism that permeates the entire Augustinian *corpus*.

[11] (*CCSL* XXXVIII, 222-244), *Psalm* 32 according to the Hebrew numeration. I will retain Augustine's Latin numbering of the Psalms for this study.

[12] See Saint Gregory of Nyssa, *Commentary on the Inscriptions of The Psalms*, trans. with an Introduction by Casimir McCambley OCSO (Brookline: MA.: Hellenic College Press, n.d.).

[13] *En. Ps.* 31.I.1.

This early reading of the Psalm certainly reveals a "grace-reading," though not yet blatantly and provocatively proclaimed as will be seen in the second *enarratio.*

Some have described these first efforts as "exegetical notes" because of their brevity (one could picture them being written in the margins of the codex), but a closer look reveals a more complex dynamic—at least by the time he arrives at this psalm. In fact this first *enarratio* on *Psalm* 31 reads like a "mini-*Confessions.*" The language and approach is not "technical-exegetical" but perhaps can best be described as "spiritual paraphrase," with abundant employment of the first person singular. His comments on *vv.* 3 and 4 reveal the dynamic that pervades the entire *enarratio*:

> v.3a. "*Quoniam tacui, inueteraueuerunt ossa mea:*" [he comments] *Quoniam non protuli ore confessionem ad salutem . . .* (*Rm.* 10:10).
>
> v.3b. "*A clamando me tota die:*" [he comments] *cum essem impius atque blasphemus, clamando contra Deum, quasi defendens et excusans peccata mea.*
>
> v.4a. "*Quoniam die ac nocte grauata est super me manus tua:*" [he comments] *Quoniam continua afflictione flagellorum tuorum,*
>
> v.4b. "*conuersus sum in aerumna mea, dum configeretur spina:*" [he comments] *Miser factus sum cognoscendo miseriam meam* (see *Rm.* 7:24), *compunctus mala conscientia.*

These comments seem quite personal. They are not made in the third person [this is what the psalmist says or means], but maintain the first person voice as the words of the Psalmist flow uninterruptedly into Augustine's words: "*in te mihi est gaudium, redime me ab ea tristitia, quam mihi peccata mea faciunt*" (7).[14] Who is speaking here—David or Augustine? Subsequent readers of the *Confessions* will recognize this kind of employment of the psalms to articulate Augustine's own conversion journey. And if this is a Psalm that proclaims grace, it also appears to be a psalm that provokes grace.

---

[14] This has been noted by Clemens Weidman in his communication "Zur exegetischen Technik Augustins in den ältesten *Enarrationes in Psalmos,*" at the *XXVIII Incontro di studiosi dell'Antichità Cristiana (6-8 maggio 1999, Augustinianum, Istituto Patristico, Rome), L'Esegesi dei Padri Latini dalle origini a Gregorio Magno.* He notes regarding Augustine's commentaries on *pss.* 15-32 what he calls "allegorische Paraphrase," commenting: "Völlig anders verfährt Augustinus in der zweiten Serie seiner frühesten Psalmenerklärungen. Die achtzehn Enarrationes zu Psalm 15-32 lassen jegliche objective Distanz vermissen. Augustinus schlüpft hier in die Rolle des Psalmisten und paraphrasiert den ganzen Psalm aus dessen Munde allegorisch. Daher möchte ich diese Psalmerklärungen als allegorische Paraphrase bezeichnen. Die Exegese Augustins stellt sich hier nicht mehr als ein Sprechen über einen heiligen Text dar, sondern als ein Mitvollziehen des Gebets, das Augustinus gemeinsam mit dem Psalmsprecher betet."

Augustine notes the loving divine responsiveness to humble human *confessio*. He categorizes v.8a of the psalm as a *responsio*:

> *Responsio Dei*: "*Intellectum dabo tibi, et statuam te in uia hac qua gradieris* (v.8a)." *Intellectum dabo tibi post confessionem, ut non recedas a uia qua ingredieris, ne tuae potestatis esse uelis.* "*Obfirmabo super te oculos meos* (v.8b)." *Ita super te faciam firmam dilectionem meam.*[15]

This early commentary expresses and models a rhetorical- dialogical conversion dynamic where human *confessio* and divine *responsio* are intimately linked. The Psalmist's dialogue with God clearly seems to have become Augustine's own. One does get the impression that herein is the genesis of the *Confessiones*, at least in part. Perhaps not surprisingly *Psalm 31* does appear at least five times in the course of the *Confessiones*, just as in this *enarratio* the forms *confessio/confiteri* occur six times in the course of 11 verses.[16] Is it this intensely personalized approach that Jerome found unsettling, expecting something more rigorous and technical? It certainly operates outside the camp of rigorous lexical and historical methods.

Finally, there is the striking fact that the only Scripture brought forth to clarify the Psalm text in this early commentary comes from Paul's *Letter to the Romans*: 10:10 in v.3 (*ore confessionem ad salutem*) and perhaps an allusion to 7:24 in vs. 4 (*miser factus sum*).[17] Paul is woven into these brief comments seamlessly, perhaps an indication that Augustine has already become aware of the close connection between Paul and the Psalms. However, these condensed comments also serve to highlight the remarkable contrast between first and second *enarratio*, separated by some two decades.

The second commentary, preached very likely in Carthage in the winter of 412-413, is heralded by a bold exordium that is virtually unique among the entire *enarratio* corpus:

> *Psalmus gratiae Dei*—this is a psalm about God's grace, and about our being justified by no merits whatever on our own part, but only by the mercy of the Lord our God which forestalls anything we may do. It is a psalm to which

---

[15] *En. Ps.* 31.II.8.

[16] V.1. "*confitentem peccata sua;*" v.3. "*confessionem ad salutem;*" v.5. "*audiens uocem confessionis in corde;*" v.6. "*remanere confessionis locum;*" v.8. "*intellectum dabo tibi post confessionem;*" v.10. "*qui non confitens Deo peccata sua.*"

[17] Augustine is reading Paul at this very same time. During this period his first attempts at a *Romans'* commentary are undertaken, the *Galatians* commentary is completed, and the *83 Diverse Questions* as well as the *Ad Simplcianum* are published. The classic starting point for the study of this period remains Alberto Pincherle's *La formazione teologica di sant'Agostino* (Rome: L'Airone, n.d.).

> the apostle's teaching has called our attention in a special way, as the reading that preceded the psalm has made clear to us all. And this is the psalm which I, insignificant though I am, have undertaken to expound to you, dearest friends.[18]

Is Augustine reading David or Paul, one might ask? The answer is both—and this connection between Psalmist and Apostle both suggests and reveals some of the particular originality that Augustine brought to his encounter with the Psalms. Perler, following Zarb, places the second *enarratio* on *Ps.* 31 at Carthage during the Winter of 412-413. Though this dating was long ago contested by De Blic who suggests it lacks the "*teneur doctrinale*" that marks the Pelagian controversy,[19] Perler cites Rondet for confirmation

---

[18] "*Psalmus gratiae Dei et iustificationis nostrae nullis praecedentibus meritis nostris, sed praeueniente nos misericordia Domini Dei nostri, commendatus maxime ore apostolico, sicut praecedens hunc psalmum lectio omnibus intimauit, a nostra tenuitate susceptus est cum Vestra Caritate tractandus,*" *en Ps.* XXXI.II.1. The English text here is taken from *Expositions of the Psalms 1-32*, intro. by Michael Fiedrowicz, trans. and notes by Maria Boulding, O.S.B., The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, ed. J.E. Rotelle (New York: New City Press, 2000), 362. The closest approximation would be the opening lines to his *enarratio* on *Ps.* 70: "*In omnibus Scripturis sanctis, gratia Dei quae liberat nos commendat se nobis, ut commendatos habeat nos,*" en. *Ps.* 70.I.1). Dated to 412-415 (see Fiedrowicz, 434), it still lacks the boldness of his opening lines for *Psalm* 31. For Augustine's commentaries on the psalms, see also Angelo Corticelli, "Introduzione," in Sant'Agostino, *Esposizioni sui Salmi*, I, NBA XXV (Rome: Cittá Nuova Editrice, 1967), vii-xlvii; Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les Commentaires Patristiques du Psautier (IIIe-Ve siècles)*, 2 vol. (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982); Georg Nicolaus Knauer, *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955). Regarding Augustine's "praying" of the psalms, see M. Vincent, "La prière selon saint Augustin d'après les '*Enarrationes in Psalmos*'," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 110 (1988): 371-402; idem, *Saint Augustin Maître de Prière d'après les 'Enarrationes in Psalmos'*, Préface de Marcel Neusch, Édition revue et corrigée, Théologie Historique 84 (Paris: Beauchesne Éditeur, 1990); Card. Michele Pellegrino, *La preghiera dei Salmi in S. Agostino* (Magnano [Italy]: Edizioni Qiqajon, 1984).

[19] J. De Blic, S.I., "La date du sermon de saint Augustin '*in psalmum 31*' (ML 36, 257-275)," *Gregorianum* 17 (1936): 407-412. There are many indications that point to an anti-Pelagian context for the second commentary on the psalm: Augustine's use of the text in the course of the controversy (e.g. *en. Ps.* 118.III.3; *pec. mer.* I.27.43; *nupt. et conc.* I.33; II.34; *c. Iul. imp.* I.67); the relationship between *gratis* and *gratia* (*en. Ps.* 31.II.7), while pre-dating the Pelagian controversy flowers in this period; the most telling is the bold emphasis on "*gratia Dei et iustificatio nostra*," for while Augustine will frequently refer to *gratia* in his polemics against the Donatists, it will specifically have an ecclesial or sacramental reference (e.g. *ep.* 128.44; *Io. eu. Tr.* 3.9; 4.16; *Breu. Col. Don.* 3.20; 42; *ges. Em.* 5). Regarding Augustine's pre-Pelagian preaching on grace, see the informative and perceptive comments of Pierre-Marie Hombert, "Augustin, prédicateur de la grâce au début de son épiscopat," in *Augustin Prédicateur (395-411). Actes du Colloque International*

and Fiedorowicz's most recent study accepts this dating.[20] I would like to propose that it bridges the ending-Donatist/beginning-Pelagian controversy (suggesting how closely interrelated doctrinally are the Donatist and Pelagian debates),[21] that because of this it lacks the intensified polemics that will subsequently scar the later Pelagian debates, and, given the ideological melting-pot that Carthage was, Augustine will recognize other currents of thought circulating in the capital city of Roman Africa. The strongest evidence for its anti-Pelagian origins are still the blatant and provocative opening lines, unmatched in any specifically anti-Donatist literature: *Psalmus gratiae Dei et iustificationis nostrae nullis praecedentibus meritis nostris, sed praeueniente nos misericordia Domini Dei nostri.* This opening salvo is followed by eight lengthy paragraphs of Pauline explanation before he ever arrives at v.1 of the psalm.[22] The language of these lengthy introductory paragraphs is implicitly apologetic and defensive, sufficient to suggest that Augustine feels obliged to both explain and vindicate his understanding of "*gratia Dei et iustificatio nostra*" in the light of criticism that is circulating.[23]

At the outset he places himself and his congregation on a hermeneutical tightrope stretched over a *uorago*—an abyss. On the one side there is

---

de Chantilly (5-7 september 1996), édités par Goulven Madec, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité—159 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1998), 217-245. Hombert clearly presumes that Augustine's second commentary on *Ps.* 31 postdates 412, 233. Hombert's comprehensive study of Augustine and grace provides in-depth theological background for the particular themes explored in his commentary on *Psalm* 31; *Gloria Gratiae. Se glorifier en Dieu, principe et fin de la théologie augustinienne de la grâce*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité, 148 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1996).

[20] Othmar Perler (with J.-L. Maier), *Les voyages de saint Augustin* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1969), 310-317, 458-461; Fiedorowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi*, 42-43. Henri Rondet, S.J., "Essais sur la chronologie des «Enarrationes in Psalmos» de saint Augustin," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 61 (1960): 281-286: "On peut donc penser que notre sermon a été prêché à Carthage au début de la querelle pélagienne; de là insistance sur la gratuité de la grâce et l'universalité du péché lors de la venue su Sauveur," 283. Rondet provides lexical and thematic justification for this dating.

[21] At the very least in the sense that both highlight what Hombert calls "des convictions profondes d'Augustine," "Augustin, prédicateur de la grâce au début de son épiscopat," 231.

[22] Nowhere during the Donatist controversy does Augustine speak so forcefully or provocatively about *grace*!

[23] Augustine notes in his *De dono perseuerantiae* (20.53) that decades before while still in Rome, Pelagius was disturbed by *Conf.* X.29.40: *da quod iubes et iube quod uis*. It certainly seems that Caelestius' preaching in Carthage not only critiqued Augustine (at least indirectly) but was also welcomed by certain ascetical circles.

the danger of falling into *praesumptio de iustitia*, and on the other, that of *cogitatio impunitatis peccatorum*—must one either arrogantly rely upon one's own saving power, or submissively capitulate to the inevitability of human weakness? One could further hypothesize a setting for this preaching by suggesting that Pelagius (as explained by his supporters) presents a spiritual program for mature Christian self-starters, and this is made evident and tenable by contrasting it with an alternative vision: a "*Pelagian*" caricature of Augustine's grace position as one proposing a passive and complacent approach to the Christian life, one that seemed to excuse sinning. Augustine, still not willing to attack publicly the ascetic Pelagius, must nonetheless show that there is another way—which represents his authentic theological position:

> *Iterum dico quod breuiter fixum omnes animo teneatis: Ne praesumas ad regnum de iustitia tua, ne praesumas ad peccandum de misericordia Dei. Respondebis: Quid ergo faciam? Psalmus iste docet nos: quo perlecto atque tractato, arbitror adiuuante misericordia Domini, uisuros nos uiam uel ubi iam ambulemus, uel quam tenere debeamus. Unusquisque pro modulo suo audiat; et sicut sibi conscius fuerit, ita uel doleat corrigendus, uel gaudeat adprobandus. Si se deuiasse inuenerit, redeat ut in uia ambulet: si se in uia inuenerit, ambulet ut perueniat. Nemo sit superbus extra uiam, nemo piger in uia.*[24]

Augustine's understanding of grace is opposed to both *pigritia* and *superbia*.

Critical to this interpretation of the psalm as a psalm of grace is the fact that, at the outset, Augustine reminds his congregation that he has chosen a reading from Paul to accompany the psalm:

> *. . . commendatus maxime ore apostolico, sicut praecedens hunc psalmum lectio omnibus intimauit . . .* (ibid.).[25]

Since Paul himself cites Psalm 31 at *Romans* 4:7-8 it can be quite certain that *Romans* 4 is the *lectio praecedens hunc psalmum*. This becomes obvious as he continues his introductory remarks:

> *Hunc autem psalmum ad eam gratiam pertinere, quo christiani sumus, testatus est apostolus Paulus: unde ipsam lectionem uobis legi uoluimus. Hoc dixit Apostolus, cum commenderet iustitiam quae ex fide est, aduersus eos qui gloriantur de iustitia quae est ex operibus, hoc ait* [he cites *Rm*: 4:1-2, a repetition of the *lectio*?]: *"Quid ergo dicemus inuenisse Abraham patrem nostrum secundum carnem? Si enim Abraham ex operibus iustificatus est, habet gloriam, sed non ad Deum." Auertat ipse Deus a nobis talem gloriam, et illud*

---

[24] *En. Ps.* 31.II.1.

[25] This suggests the liturgical-exegetical link in early Christian reading of the Bible, shaped by a Liturgy of the Word where Old Testament, Psalm, and New Testament readings formed a unified *sacramental* whole.

> *potius audiamus: "Qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur"* (1 *Cor.* 1:31). *Multi enim gloriantur de operibus, et inuenis multos paganos propterea nolle fieri christianos, quia quasi sufficiunt sibi de bona uita sua.*[26]

Do we find here a further clue to the conflicting theological poles driving Augustine and the Pelagians—making even more problematic the complexity of Paul's own arguments? Augustine's assertion of the necessity of grace is here closely tied to the deconstruction of Pagan pretensions of self-righteousness—and much recent scholarship suggests the strong hold that "paganism" still continued to have upon Late Antique society.[27] Did Pelagius read Augustine's anti-pagan polemic as irresponsibly supplying Christians with an excuse for complacency? Augustine will give voice to the conflicting Pagan-Christian reception to his teaching. A Pagan's "*iam bene uiuo, quid mihi necessarius est Christus*"[28] could become all too conveniently a Christian's "[*iam credo,*] *quid mihi necessarius est bona opera habere.*"[29]

These are the theological difficulties confronting Augustine as he carefully walks his congregation across the tightrope already indicated. On the one hand, Abraham could claim the glory of righteousness, but it is the righteousness of grace—*gloria ad Deum*: "*Ergo ex fide iustificatus est Abraham*"

---

[26] *En. Ps.* 31.II.2. Augustine makes clear in his commentary on *ps.* 118 that he is well aware of Paul's use of this text. "*Itaque in uiis Domini, quas omnes fides una complectitur, qua in eum creditur qui iustificat impium (Rm. 4:5), qui etiam dixit, "Ego sum uia" (Jn. 14,6), nemo peccatum operatur, sed confitetur. Deuiat ergo, cum peccat; et ideo peccatum uiae non tribuitur, quod a deuiante committitur: sed in uia fidei pro non peccantibus habentur, quibus peccata non inputantur. De quibus apostolus Paulus iustitiam fidei commendans, in psalmo scriptum esse monstrauit. "Beati quorum remissae sunt iniquitates, et quorum tecta sunt peccata: beatus uir cui non imputauit Dominus peccatum" (Rm. 4:7, Paul quoting Ps. 31(32): 1-2). Hoc praestant uiae Domini; ac per hoc, quoniam iustus ex fide uiuit (Rm. 1:17), ab ista uia Domini illa alienat iniquitas, quae est infidelitas*" (*en. Ps.* 118.III.3).

[27] This is evident in the newly discovered *Dolbeau sermons 198* (Mainz 62) and *23* (Mainz 59), *Sermons*, III/11, *Newly Discovered Sermons*, translation and notes by Edmund Hill, O.P., The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, (Hyde Park: N.Y.: New City Press, 1997), 180-237, 392-410. The former is dated to 404, the latter, 409; see also Robert Dodaro, "*Christus Sacerdos*: Augustine's Polemic against Roman Pagan Priesthoods in *De ciuitate Dei*," *Augustinianum* XXXIII (1993): 101-135; idem, *Christus sacerdos*: Augustine's Preaching Against Pagan Priests in the light of *S. Dolbeau 26 and 23*," in *Augustin prédicateur (395-411). Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly (5-7 september 1996)*, édités par G. Madec, Coll. "Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité," 159, (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1998), 377-393.

[28] *En. Ps.* 31.II.2.

[29] See ibid. 3: "*facio ergo quidquid uolo, quia etsi bona opera non habuero, et tantum credidero in Deum, deputatur mihi ad iustitiam . . .*".

(2). There is no room for *superbia*. On the other hand, the Christian who says: "*faciam ergo quidquid uolo, quia etsi bona opera non habuero, et tantum credidero in Deum, deputatur mihi ad iustitiam*" (3) has already plummeted headlong into the *uorago*: *lapsus demersus est*. There is no room for *pigritia*. Faith-infused grace is not a license to sin. At this point Augustine further highlights the problematic by calling upon the Apostle James (an example of Augustine proceeding *per contraria*):

> *Scriptura autem Dei uerusque intellectus, non solum periclitantem a periculo liberat, sed et demersum a profundo eleuat. Respondeo ergo tamquam contra Apostolum, et dico de ipso Abraham, quod inuenimus etiam in epistola alterius apostoli, qui uolebat corrigere homines, qui male intellexerant istum apostolum* (ibid.).

Just as James challenged those who mis-read Paul, so too must Augustine—a reminder that this psalm *enarratio* continues to be about Paul! He continues:

> *Iacobus enim in Epistola sua, contra eos qui nolebant bene operari de sola fide praesumentes, ipsius Abrahae opera commendauit, cuius Paulus fidem . . .*

If Paul commended *fides Abrahae*, James commended *opera Abrahae*. Thus, the theological position Augustine finds himself struggling to explain is not novel. He continues:

> *Et non sunt sibi aduersi Apostoli. Dicit autem opus omnibus notum, Abraham filium suum immolandum Deo obtulit (Jac.* 2:21). *Magnum opus, sed ex fide. Laudo superaedificationem operis, sed uideo fidei fundamentum: laudo fructum boni operis, sed in fide agnosco radicem. Si autem hoc praeter fidem rectam faceret Abraham, nihil illi prodesset qualecumque illud opus esset. Rursum si sic teneret fidem Abraham, ut cum ei Deus imperaret offerre sibi immolandum filium suum, diceret apud semetipsum, Non facio, et tamen credo quia me etiam contemnentem iussa sua liberat Deus; fides sine operibus mortua esset, et tamquam radix sine fructu sterilis atque arida remaneret* (ibid.).

Both *opus praeter fidem rectam* and *non facio* are equally empty—the one sterile and withered activity, the other dead faith. In the paragraph that follows he gives this a positive restatement:

> *Nemo ergo computet bona opera sua ante fidem: ubi fides non erat, bonum opus non erat. Bonum enim opus intentio facit, intentionem fides dirigit* (4).

However, Augustine is not yet at the point of resolution nor ready to avoid deliberate confrontation to make his point. Decrying "*talis . . . qui optime currit praeter uiam*" he will certainly have vexed the Pelagians with the assertion:

> *Nonne ergo erat melius et tolerabilius, ut esset gubernator ille aliquanto inualidior, ut cum labore et aliqua difficultate gubernacula regeret, et tamen rectum debitumque cursum teneret; rursumque ille pigrius etiam et imbecillius, tamen in uia ambularet, quam praeter uiam*

> *fortiter curreret? Optimus ergo ille qui et uiam tenet, et bene ibi ambulat: sequentis autem spei, qui etsi aliquantum claudicat, non omnino ut erret, aut remaneat, sed progreditur etsi paulatim. Fortasse enim sperandum est, eum quo tendit etiam tardius peruenturum* (ibid.).

Here, it may be suggested, theology, exegesis, and dialectics merge as Augustine perhaps provocatively responds to latent Pelagian reductionism with his own form of the same: either *praeter uiam* or *in uia*. There can only be one choice! Although limping, those *in uia* will arrive; those *praeter uiam*, even if sprinting, are already lost.

Augustine, though, has still not completed his lengthy explanatory introduction that will serve as reading guide once the text of the Psalm is finally taken up. Paul himself will suggest the formula of resolution for the seemingly "active—passive" dilemma, with his intimate linking of *fides* and *dilectio*. What kind of faith does Augustine propose? *Fides quae per dilectionem operatur* (*Gal.* 5:6). Augustine restates this into an aphorism that blends theological complexity with linguistic precision: *tene ergo fidem operaturus*—"as you're about to act, hold on to faith" (5). In order to make this point there follows an intense employment of Pauline texts, interspersed with brief formulaic comments by Augustine. In the next four paragraphs he cites *Rm.* 13:10; *Gal.* 5:14; back to *Rm.* 13:9,10; then 1 *Cor.* 13:13; 1 *Tm.* 1:5; *Rm.* 3:28; again *Gal.* 5:6; 1 *Cor.* 13:2; back to *Rm.* 4:5; 1:25; 3:23; 4:3,4; 6:23; 4:5,6. These fourteen references to Paul have only been briefly interrupted by *Ps.* 36:27 (*declina a malo et fac bonum*), a brief reference to *Luke*'s (10:30) parable of the Good Samaritan, read now in a grace context (*memento quia etsi languebas, et in uia semiuiuus iacebas, leuatus es in iumentum, et perductus in stabulum*), and *Ps.* 35:4 (*noluit intelligere ut bene ageret*). The crisp aphoristic assertions sprinkled throughout provide clarity:

> *Ipsa dilectio uacare non potest* (5).
> *Purga ergo amorem tuum* (5).
> *Quod credit, fidei est, quod operatur, caritatis est* (twice repeated), (5).
> *Opus autem fidei dilectio est* (6).
> *Noli remanere, noli retro conuerti, noli deuiare* (6).
> *Si uis esse alienus a gratia, iacta merita tua* (7).
> *Nemo iactet bona opera sua ante fidem, nemo sit piger in bonis operibus accepta fide* (8).

There is, it could be said, a deliberate *cumulative* effect intended by this approach. Augustine's listeners are overwhelmed by a flood of scriptural citations affirming the interconnection between grace, faith, and love; they are summoned to action by call after call to make love operative; and they are reassured by the sheer weight, drive, and confidence of Augustine's method and discourse that this way is secure—the *pigritia/superbia* dilemma is thus resolved. Augustine thereby can exonerate himself from any accusations

of misleading the flock entrusted to him. One cannot miss the polemic implied here as he completes his summary statement before beginning at long last to take up the actual psalm text. He insists *ego liber sum*—as Paul was *liber*. I have done my duty and am free from any charge of pastoral irresponsibility (there is clear identification here between Augustine and Paul):

> *Intendite ergo uos: alioquin male intelligendo proicitis uos in illam uoraginem impune peccandi: et ego liber sum, sicut ipse Apostolus ab omnibus male intelligentibus liber fuit. Libenter enim male intellexerunt, ne bona opera sequerentur. Nolite esse de numero talium, fratres. Dicitur in quodam psalmo, de quodam homine tali, id est de tali genere, quasi de uno: "Noluit," inquit, "intelligere ut bene ageret" (Ps.* 35:4). *Non dictum est, Non potuit intelligere. Uos ergo oportet ut uelitis intelligere,* (note the active understanding) *ut bene agatis. Intellectus enim uobis non deerit manifestus. Quis est manifestus intellectus? Nemo iactet bona opera sua ante fidem, nemo sit piger in bonis operibus accepta fide. Dat Deus ergo indulgentiam omnibus impiis, et eos iustificat ex fide* (8).

At this point, Augustine has completed 1/3 of the homily and has not yet arrived at the text of the psalm that is driving the homily. It might be said that these lengthy introductory comments have served two purposes for Augustine, expressed in his attention just now to *manifestus intellectus*. If this is indeed a psalm of grace and justification, it is also, at its title indicated, a psalm of *intelligentia*: "*ipsi Dauid intelligentiae.*" *Intelligentia gratiae* is what the psalmist prophesized, what Paul proclaimed, and what Augustine and his fellow Christians now live. *Manifestus intellectus* will be apparent in the unity of *fides* and *opera*, markedly contrasting with the antithesis of *superbia* and *praesumptio* (*pigritia*) that have been denounced with equal vigor. This enables him at last to undertake the psalm text:

> *Iam Psalmus incipit, et incipit intellectus. Intellectus ergo uel intelligentia ipsa est, ut noueris nec iactare te debere de meritis tuis, nec praesumere de impunitate peccati* (9).

His engagement at last with the psalm echoes his beginning words of the homily: *psalmus gratiae Dei et iustificationis nostrae nullis praecedentibus meritis nostris, sed praeueniente nos misericordia Domini Dei nostri.* And despite his assertions that he has already discharged his duty—*ego liber sum*—it is apparent that he will leave nothing to chance regarding the depth of this understanding:

> *Prima ergo intelligentia, ut te noueris peccatorem. Consequens intelligentia est, ut cum ex fide per dilectionem bene coeperis operari, ne hoc uiribus tuis, sed gratiae Dei deputaueris* (ibid.).

The actual verse by verse commentary that finally commences becomes an on-going lesson in both humility and responsibility—a clear indication of the nuanced nature of the *intelligentia* Augustine is holding up for emula-

tion. Without ever being able to accuse Augustine of proceeding by the straight and narrow path, his circuitous method is in many ways held together by the Lukan Pharisee and Publican (see *Lk.* 18: 9ff., perhaps the gospel of the day). [Many of the other scriptural texts called upon will be stimulated by terminological connections with the psalm text (e.g. *dolus* will lead him to *Mt.* 23:27 and *John* 1:47—Pharisees with *dolus*, Nathaniel without *dolus*).] They become types: the one representing *superbia: in defensione peccatorum suorum iactantes merita sua* (10), the other, exemplifying *humilitas: tunsio pectoris, obtritio cordis* (11). These two fundamental approaches will carry through the rest of the psalm commentary. The Pharisee:

> "*uerba habebant, facta non habebant*" (9), "*genus superbiae*" (10), "*quia spernebat ceteros*" (11), "*peruersus et nesciens*" (12), "*tacuit confessionem, clamauit praesumtionem*" (13), "*exaltatur*" (14), "*clamando in defensione peccati sui*" (15), "*pronuntiare aduersus Deum*" (16), etc.

The Publican:

> "*ille enim fortis est, qui non in se, sed in Deo fortis est*" (10), "*sed percutiebat pectus suum*" (11), "*se adtendebat, ut primo sibi displiceret, et sic Deo placeret*" (12), "*nihil praeter se respiciet, et displicebit sibi, quia agnoscit se*" (13), "*quia humiliauit se*" (14), "*sensus doloris*" (15), "*clamat aeger ad medicum*" (16), etc.

The indictment of the pride of the Pharisee is in direct proportion to the affirmation of the humility of the Publican. And throughout Paul repeatedly returns as model and example for this theology of grace:

> *Ille enim fortis est, qui non in se, sed in Deo fortis est. Propter illud, "Ter Dominum rogaui ut auferret eum a me; et dixit mihi: Sufficit tibi gratia mea." "Gratia mea," dixit, "non uirtus tua." "Sufficit," inquit, "tibi gratia mea; nam uirtus in infirmitate perficitur"* (2 *Cor.* 12: 8-9). *Unde alio loco ipse ait: "Quando infirmor, tunc fortis sum"* (2 *Cor.* 12:10) (10).

The *stimulus carnis* of Paul models and confirms the humble stance of grace-dependent Christian living—a condition that continues even after justification. Thus Paul himself witnesses to the correct understanding of his own theology of grace. Augustine takes up v.7 of the psalm: "*exsultatio mea, redime me,*" and Paul provides the explanation:

> *Iam iustificatus erat et Apostolus, et quid ait? "Non solum," inquit, "sed etiam nos ipsi primitias habentes Spiritus, et ipsi in nobismetipsis ingemiscimus"* (*Rm.* 8:23). *Unde "redime me?" Quia "ipsi in nobismetipsis ingemiscimus, adoptionem expectantes, redemtionem corporis nostri." Ecce ergo unde "redime me;" quia adhuc expectamus in nobis ingemiscentes redemtionem corporis nostri. Unde ergo "exsultatio mea?" Ibi sequitur idem Apostolus, et dicit, "Spe enim salui facti sumus: spes autem quae uidetur, non est spes. Quod enim uidet quis, quid sperat? Si autem quod non uidemus speramus, per patientiam expectamus"* (*Rm.* 8:24-25) (20).

He goes on to note how this humble *spes* leads to *patientia* and *tolerantia* regarding the present *angustia*. What we see underway here is likewise Augustine's developing awareness of what is and is not to be expected *sub gratia*: "*iam iustificatus erat et apostolus.*"[30] This too is what is meant by *intelligentia gratiae*:

> *Respondetur: "Intellectum dabo tibi" (Ps.* 31:8a). *Ipse est psalmus intelligentiae. "Intellectum dabo tibi, et statuam te in uia hac, qua gradieris." Quid est, "statuam te in uia hac, qua gradieris?" Non ut haereas ibi, sed ut ab ea non aberres. Dabo intellectum, ut cognoscas te semper, et semper gaudeas in spe ad Deum; donec ad illam patriam peruenias, ubi iam non spes, sed res erit. "Obfirmabo super te oculos meos"* (8b). *Non a te auferam oculos meos, quia et tu non auferes a me oculos tuos. Iam iustificatus, iam post remissionem peccatorum leua oculos tuos ad Deum. Putruerat enim cor tuum cum esset in terra. Non gratis audis, Sursum cor, ne putreat"* (21).

Both directly and indirectly he consistently asserts that *superbia* remains the continuing enemy of grace, and *superbia* can be reduced to false self-knowledge: *dabo intellectum ut cognoscas te semper.* Thus, even after Baptism, there is room only for humility, and this is what Paul teaches to the *iam iustificatus*: "*tu ergo oculos tuos in illum erige, et non timebis*" (ibid). This is the *intellectus*, manifested in both joy and uprightness of heart—and this will take Augustine to the conclusion where *exsultatio* and *cor rectum* offer critical components for the *intelligentia gratiae* Augustine has been about throughout the psalm, one precluding *pigritia*, the other, *superbia*.

Exsultate, the psalmist says. How ought one understand this *exsultatio*?

> *Ergo quid concluditur? "Laetamini in Domino, et exsultate iusti* (v.11)." *O qui laetamini in uobis! o impii, o superbi, qui laetamini in uobis: iam credentes in eum qui iustificat impium, deputetur fides uestra ad iustitiam (Rm.* 4:4). "*Laetamini in Domino, et exsultate iusti.*" "*Et exsultate,*" *subaudi,* "*in Domino.*" *Quare? Quia iam iusti. Unde iusti? Non meritis uestris, sed gratia illius. Unde iusti? Quia iustificati* (24).

This call to true joy precludes any passive or complacent understanding of what is meant by the reception of grace and justification. On the other hand, and Augustine is now at his final words of the homily, a *cor rectum* insures that one knows what to attribute to oneself, and what to attribute to God:

> *Breuiter dico, sed tamen maxime commendandum: Deo autem gratias, quod in fine est, inhaereat sensibus uestris. Inter rectum cor et prauum cor hoc interest: quisquis homo quidquid patitur praeter uoluntatem, afflictiones, moerores, labores, humilitationes, non tribuit nisi uoluntati Dei iustae, non illi dans insipientiam . . .* (25).

---

[30] A few paragraphs earlier he quoted from *Rm.* 7 and still seems to view it as a "*sub lege*" statement. Here, however, he is clearly states that even after grace—"*iam iustificatus erat*"—there is turmoil and struggle.

If Job is the classic example of this, humbly bearing with his own abasement:

> *"Dominus dedit, Dominus abstulit." Ecce rectum cor: Sicut Domino placuit, ita factum est; "sit nomen Domini benedictum"* (cfr. *Iob* 1:21) (26).

this is to be found above all in the *exemplum* of the Only Son:

> *Etiam Unicus sine peccato, non tamen sine flagello. Unde ipse Unicus portans infirmitatem tuam, et praefigurans in se personam tuam, tamquam caput gestans personam etiam corporis sui, cum adpropinquaret passioni ex homine quem gerebat contristatus est, ut te laetificaret; contristatus est, ut te consolaretur* (ibid.).

Here Augustine calls to mind that it has been the *uox totius Christi* that has been speaking throughout this psalm. And Paul, now "*miles*," has learned his lessons well from his "*imperator*."

> *Adtende Paulum exsultantem, propinquantem passioni: "Ego autem iam," inquit, "immolor, et tempus resolutionis meae instat. Bonum certamen certaui, cursum consummaui, fidem seruaui: de cetero superest mihi corona iustitiae, quam mihi Dominus reddet in illa die iustus iudex. Non solum autem mihi, sed et omnibus qui diligunt aduentum eius"* (2 *Tm.* 4:6-8). *Uidete quemadmodum exsultat, uenturus ad passionem. Ergo gaudet coronandus, contristatur coronaturus. Quid igitur portabat? Infirmitatem quorumdam, qui ueniente tribulatione uel morte contristantur. Sed uide quomodo eos ducit in directionem cordis . . .* (ibid.).

Thus Paul and even the Pauline lens through which Augustine reads the Psalm finally gives way to a Christ-reading of the Psalm: *uidete quomodo hoc docet Dominus Iesus Christus . . .* (ibid.). This, in the final analysis, is the *directio cordis* Augustine learned from Paul, and the *directio cordis* that was the ultimate intention of the Psalmist:

> *Hoc ergo fac, gaudens in his quae tibi accidunt: et si uenerit dies ille ultimus, gaude. Aut si subrepit humanae cuiusdam uoluntatis fragilitas, cito dirigatur in Deum, ut sis in eis quibus dicitur: Gloriamini omnes recti corde* (ibid.).

Augustine ends not only with the image of *cor rectum* but also of *uoluntatis fragilitas*—grace leaves no room for arrogant complacency.

Conclusion

Certainly Jerome was correct in noting that Augustine was about something different in his approach to the psalms. Here, in *Psalm* 31, Augustine found a prophecy of grace, the expression of the unity between the two Testaments (David/Paul), an instance of the voice of *Christus caput* prefiguring the voice of *Christus corpus*, and all of this carefully viewed through the reading lens of privileged Pauline texts. Augustine has certainly highlighted

the prophetic nature of the psalms, a marked contrast with at least some of the Greek tradition that remained within the historical dimension of the psalms. This is quite apparent in Julian of Eclanum's Latin version of Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on the *Psalms*—interestingly the only other intact Latin commentary on *Psalm* 31 from the period.[31] In Julian's translation, Theodore locates the message of the *Psalm* within the context of Hezekiah's illness as a prophecy of recovery.[32] For Augustine, however, the *Psalm*'s primary intent and message is ever Christ. It is is *a prophecy of grace*,[33] and for this reading Augustine turns to Paul:

> *"Pro hac orabit ad te omnis sanctus, in tempore opportuno:" quando manifestabitur Nouum Testamentum, quando manifestabitur gratia Christi, quod est tempus opportunum . . .*[34]

Perhaps Augustine himself would object to any effort to propose a unitary Pauline lens for reading the psalms: *doctrina Dei una est* he would surely insist (ibid.). Yet, the fact is that Paul is more present than David in this psalm commentary, 31 explicit citations from Paul compared to the psalm's eleven verses: Paul literally overtakes this psalm. What is one to make of this? What seems clear is that Augustine's awareness of how Paul himself took up this psalm in his *Letter to the Romans* and re-read the Abrahamic-Mosaic tradition in the light of Christ provided Augustine with the necessary impetus to continue exploring, developing, and certainly expanding these initial Pauline connections.[35] If indeed the psalms are the *uox Christi, caput et corpus*, it was Paul's very own voice that helped Augustine realize this, echoed by his persistent calling upon the Apostle throughout to secure a correct reading: "*sicut dicit Apostolus*" (1), "*testatus est apostolus Paulus*" (2), "*hoc ergo Apostolus sic commendauit*" (7), "*Attende Paulum*" (26), etc. Paul guided and enlightened Augustine's reading of *Psalm* 31, and, it may be suggested,

---

[31] The *Breuiarium in Psalmos* (*PL* XXVI, 911-914 for *Psalm* 31), long attributed to Jerome, has been shown to be spurius, CCL LXXII, v; see Peri, 29. There is merely a brief 10 lines comment on *Psalm* 31 in Jerome's *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, XXX1 (*CCSL* 72, 203-204).

[32] <Psalmus> XXX<I>, 1-2, (*CCSL* LXXXVIII/A, 139). See Rondeau, *Les Commentaires Patristiques du Psautier*, I, 175-188.

[33] Regarding the psalms as prophecy see Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi*, 110, 142, 138, 234.

[34] *En. Ps.* 31.II.18.

[35] At the outset of these considerations, the presence of Paul and grace in the first *enarratio* was noted: "*Ipsi Dauid intelligentiae, qua intelligitur non meritis operum, sed gratia Dei hominem liberari, confitentem peccata sua,*" *en. Ps.* 31.I.1. See also note 26.

this Pauline lens reveals one aspect of the Bishop of Hippo's unique and distinctive approach to the Psalms. What Jerome noted early on as *discrepatio* and *diuersitas* would only continue to blossom and flourish in Augustine, but with a contrary intention, to show the lack of *discrepatio* and *diuersitas* between David and Paul, Old Testament and New, prophecy and fulfillment. Paul taught all this to Augustine, that this was a *Psalm of grace and justification*, the grace and justification of Christ, a reminder once again of the profound and pervasive impact the Apostle Paul had upon the Bishop of Hippo.

Villanova University, Dept. of Theology/Religious Studies
Villanova, PA 19085, U.S.A.

FULGENTIUS VON RUSPE, *EPIST.* 13,3: *THAPSENSIS* ODER *THARRENSIS*?

VON

ANTONIO PIRAS

1. Bekannt sind die Ereignisse, die sich in Nordafrika in den ersten Jahrzehnten des 5. Jahrhunderts abspielten, als die Vandalen von Geiserich, nachdem sie das schon schwankende Herz des weströmischen Reiches überflutet hatten, eine der reichsten und romanisiertesten Provinzen durch die Straße von Gibraltar erreichten. Sie landeten in Afrika 429 und nur zehn Jahre darauf eroberten sie Karthago, so daß Valentinian III. nicht umhin konnte, ihre Herrschaft anzuerkennen.

Von da an beherrschten die Vandalen das Westmittelmeer und plünderten seine Küsten: Sizilien, Sardinien, Korsika, die Balearen und die übrigen nordafrikanischen Provinzen fielen recht bald in Geiserichs Hände. Im Friedensvertrag, der 474 zwischen dem Vandalenkönig und dem Kaiser Zenon abgeschlossen wurde, wurden alle Eroberungen des Geiserich anerkannt.[1]

Betreffs der Religionspolitik erwiesen sich die Vandalen als nicht tolerant: Sie zielten nämlich darauf hin, dem im Gebiete schon gewurzelten Katholizismus einen starren Arianismus aufzudrängen, der nicht nur ein bequemes *instrumentum regni* darstellte, sondern auch eine Art, ihre ethnische Identität zu schützen.[2] Nach Geiserichs Tod wurde solche katholikenfeindliche Politik von seinen Nachfolgern, insbesondere von Thrasamund fortgeführt, der verordnete, man sollte keine neuen katholischen Bischöfe mehr ernennen, um das Aussterben des katholischen Episkopats dadurch hervorzurufen. Dennoch, als sich die Zahl der offenen Stühle vermehrte, handelten die Bischöfe der Byzacena dem Edikt Thrasamunds zuwider und sorgten dabei für die Nachfolge. Bei dieser Gelegenheit wurde auch Fulgentius trotz seiner Protesten zum Bischof von Ruspe ernannt.

---

[1] Zu diesen Ereignissen vgl. im allgemeinen Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955).

[2] Vgl. dazu H.E. Giesecke, *Die Ostgermanen und der Arianismus* (München 1939).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 156-160

Thrasamunds Reaktion ließ auf sich nicht warten und die rebellischen Bischöfe wurden verbannt. Auf Sardinien kamen somit etwa hundert Geistlichen an: da waren z.B. Felicianus von Karthago und der Bischof von Hippo, der die sterblichen Reste des Augustinus mitbrachte.[3] All diese Geistlichen wurden vom Bischof von Calaris Primasius (oder Brumasius) gastfreundlich aufgenommen.

Nach der *Vita Fulgentii* zeichnete sich der neugewählte Bischof von Ruspe vor all diesen Persönlichkeiten aus, deren er die *lingua* und das *ingenium* war.[4] Während seines insgesamt fast fünfzehnjährigen Aufenthaltes auf Sardinien gründete Fulgentius eine Mönchsgemeinschaft mit einem eigenen Skriptorium, welche wider Thrasamunds Absicht einen echten Resonanzboden seiner Lehre darstellte.[5] Hier verfasste er verschiedene theologische Schriften, um die ihm gestellten Fragen (typisch ist der Fall der Briefe 15. und 17.) zu beantworten, wie die *Vita* berichtet.[6]

2. Zur verbliebenen Korrespondenz des Fulgentius gehört auch der Briefwechsel mit seinem Schüler Ferrandus, der nach Lapeyre aus den Jahren 523-527 datiert.[7] Der zweite Brief des Ferrandus an Fulgentius, der in der Ausgabe von J. Fraipont[8] als *epistula* XIII erscheint, ist in der Handschriftentradition als *Epistula de quinque quaestionibus* bezeichnet[9] wegen des in fünf Punkte gegliederten Inhalts. Solche Punkte entsprechen den Fragen, die Ferrandus dem Meister unterbreitet:[10] 1. *Utrum Trinitas inseparabilis propter unam eamdemque naturam, operationem ac uoluntatem, dici debeat separabiles habere personas, an etiam in personis sit omnino separabilis praedicanda* (13,2,1ff.); 2. *Utrum Deus Dei Filius sicut dicitur natus, passus, mortuus, crucifixus; ita eius diuinitatem confirmare nos oporteat natam, passam, mortuam, crucifixam* (13,2,14ff.); 3. *Utrum anima Christi susceptricis deitatis plenam habeat omnino notitiam* (13,2,20f.); 4. Daraus, daß die afrikanische Kirche pflegt, *per Iesum Christum Filium tuum Dominum nostrum, qui tecum uiuit et regnat in unitate Spiritus*

---

[3] Vgl. P. Siniscalco, Agostino, l'Africa e la Sardegna, *L'Africa romana. Atti del VI convegno di studio* (Sassari 1989) 535-545; als etwas problematisch erweist sich L.M. Gastoni, Le reliquie di S. Agostino in Sardegna, *ebd.* 583-593.

[4] *Vita Fulg.* 18 (PL 65,138).

[5] Vgl. E. Cau, Fulgenzio e la cultura scritta in Sardegna agli inizi del VI secolo, *Sandalion* 2 (1979) 221-229, bes. 223.

[6] *Vita Fulg.* 18.

[7] G.G. Lapeyre, *Vie de Saint Fulgence de Ruspe* (Paris 1929) 330.

[8] J. Fraipont, *Sancti Fulgentii episcopi Ruspensis opera* (Turnhout 1968) 384-387 (CCL 91).

[9] Solch ein Titel kommt schon im Codex Parisinus lat. 2156 (Bibl. Nat.) aus dem 10. Jh. vor.

[10] Vgl. A. Isola (ed.), *Fulgenzio di Ruspe. Le lettere* (Roma 1999) 225-226.

sancti zu beten, kann man schließen, daß nur der Sohn mit dem Vater herrscht? (13,2,34ff.); 5. In der lukanischen Erzählung des Abendmahls wird von zwei verschiedenen Kelchen oder von einem zweimal angebotenen Kelch gesprochen? (13,2,42ff.).

3. Der Teil, der uns interessiert, ist der Briefschluß. Ferrandus bittet hier Fulgentius um eine Kopie des Buches *De regula uerae fidei*[11] und eines jetzt verlorenen Briefes an einen gewissen *Iohannes Tharsensis episcopus*, wo man über einen (vielleicht den *maleficia* ergebenen) Verbrecher diskutierte, der dem Richter nicht ausgeliefert werden sollte:

> *Rogo etiam, ut librum de regula uerae fidei relegendum nobis iubeas destinari, et epistulam ad Iohannem Tharsensem episcopum, ubi de malefico quodam iudici non tradendo memini plenissime disputatum* (13,3,55-58).

Was *Iohannes Tharsensis episcopus* betrifft, meint A. Mandouze,[12] der sich eine Konjektur von Fraipont[13] zu eigen macht, in der Handschriftenüberlieferung liege hier eine Korruptel statt eines ursprünglichen *Thapsensis* vor, da es sich um eine «siège dont l'appartenance à l'Afrique n'est pas certaine» handele. In der Tat war *Thapsus* der Name eines Städtchens der Byzacena (heute Ras Dimas, in Tunesien) und obendrein der Bischofssitz des berühmten Vigilius, der am sogenannten Konzil von Karthago 484 teilnahm.[14]

Eine sorgfältige Prüfung der Handschriften dürfte aber einer anderen und meines Erachtens triftigeren Interpretation aufmachen. Drei der fünf Handschriften, die den Brief des Ferrandus überliefern, d.h. U (10. Jh.), F (11. Jh.) und Y (13. Jh.),[15] bieten *tarsensem* an, wogegen die ältesten, d.h. A (8. Jh.) und K (9. Jh.),[16] *tarrensem* haben.

---

[11] Es handelt sich um die Schrift *De fide ad Petrum*: Fraipont CCL 91 A, 709-760.

[12] A. Mandouze, *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303-533)*: Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire 1 (Paris 1982) 608.

[13] Fraipont, S. VII.

[14] Über Vigilius von Thapsus vgl. im allgemeinen M. Simonetti, Vigilio di Tapso, *Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane* (Genova 1984) 3591f.; Mandouze, 1204f. Im Bischofslist des Konzils von Karthago erscheint Vigilius nicht als *Thapsensis*, sondern als *Thapsitanus*: vgl. J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* 7 (Nachdr. Graz 1960-62), 1161. Das adjektiv von Thapsus ist also nicht *Thapsensis*, sondern *Thapsitanus*, was unsere These zu bestätigen scheint.

[15] U = Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 2156; F = Vaticanus Latinus 641; Y = Codex Alcobacensis CCVII (415), Lisboa, Bibl. Nac.

[16] A = Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 1796; K = Troyes, Bibl. Munic. 2405.

Von einem streng philologischen Gesichtspunkt aus versteht man nicht die Notwendigkeit, in den Text mit solch einer konjekturalen Berichtigung einzugreifen, zumal die durch beide ältesten Handschriften überlieferte Lesart alle Voraussetzungen erfüllt, um aufgenommen zu werden.[17] Die Variante *tarrensis* bezieht sich offensichtlich auf Tharros, eine wohlbekannte und aus der phönizisch-punischen Zeit stammende Küstenstadt Westsardiniens,[18] die höchstwahrscheinlich schon im 6. Jahrhundert einen Bischofsstuhl hatte. Das scheint durch einen am Ende der fünfziger Jahre ausgegrabenen altchristlichen Kultkomplex bestätigt zu sein. Dieser Komplex besteht aus einer *ecclesia cathedralis* und einem Monumentalbaptisterium mit rechteckigem Plan, das aus 5. bzw. 6. Jh. datieren dürfte.[19] In einer neuerschienenen und wertvollen Arbeit denkt P.G. Spanu genauererweise, «che la diocesi con gli ambienti funzionali alla sede vescovile risalga all'estrema età vandalica, durante la permanenza dei presuli africani esiliati da Trasamondo in Sardegna nei primi decenni del VI secolo».[20]

In Anbetracht der Datierung des 13. Briefes aus den Jahren 523-527 (die verlorene *epistula ad Iohannem* datiert selbstverständlich aus einiger Zeit früher und läßt sich wahrscheinlich auf den sardinischen Aufenthalt des Fulgentius zurückführen) darf man annehmen, dieser Iohannes, dessen Bischofsstuhl nicht viel früher gestift worden sollte, hat die maßgebende Anwesenheit des Fulgentius genutzt, um ihm eine spezifische und konkrete Frage zu unterbreiten, d.h. ob ein bestimmter Verbrecher dem Richter auszuliefern war. Wir haben übrigens gesehen, daß selbst die *Vita Fulgentii* berichtet,[21] während des sardinischen Exils und freilich auch nach seiner Heimkehr erteilte der Bischof von Ruspe Ratschläge all denjenigen, die ihm theologische Fragen und pastorale Probleme vorlegten.

Es fehlen also auch keine geschichtlichen Beweise, um die durch die zwei ältesten Handschriften belegte Lesart zu verteidigen. Es ist außerdem

---

[17] Unabhängig von dieser Arbeit ist Raimondo Zucca der Universität Sassari in einem Aufsatz, der im Druck ist, zum selben Schluß gekommen. Bei ihm bedanke ich mich sehr dafür, daß er mir sein Manuskript so freundlich gezeigt hat.

[18] Zu dieser Stadt vgl. insbesondere P. Meloni, *La Sardegna romana* (Sassari ²1990) 286-291.

[19] Vgl. dazu A. Boscolo, Su due fonti battesimali protocristiani della Sardegna, *Archivio Storico Sardo* 27 (1961) 101-114, welcher für Tharros an einen *chorepiscopus* denkt; vgl. auch P. Testini, Il battistero di Tharros, *Atti del XIII Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura. Cagliari, 6-12 aprile 1963* (Roma 1966) 191-199.

[20] P.G. Spanu, *La Sardegna bizantina tra VI e VII secolo* (Oristano 1998) 83.

[21] *Vita Fulg.* 18 (PL 65,139) *domus illa tunc Caralitanae ciuitatis oraculum fuit.*

bedeutungsvoll—ohne den Grundsatz *recentiores non deteriores* zu ignorieren—, die Handschriften, die *tarsensem* haben, sind zeitgenössisch oder sogar später als der Untergang der Stadt und als die Bischofsstuhlverlegung von Tharros nach Oristano, die um 1070 vorfiel.[22] Die Vergessenheit von Tharros und vielleicht auch die biblische *ruminatio* der Schreibermönche, denen Ortsnamen wie *Tharsis* und *Tarsus* vertraut waren, dürften die Korruptel von *T(h)arrensem* in *T(h)arsensem*[23] herbeigeführt haben.

Facoltà Teologica della Sardegna
I-09129 *Cagliari*, via Sanjust 13

[22] Vgl. R. Turtas, *Storia della Chiesa in Sardegna dalle origini al Duemila* (Roma 1999) 109, Anm. 36.

[23] Das Adjektiv *Tharsensis* erscheint z.B. in Apg 9,11.

MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR ON THE STRUCTURAL DYNAMICS OF REVELATION

BY

ADAM G. COOPER

In the longest of Maximus' *Ambigua* addressed to his spiritual associate Bishop John of Cyzicus, we come across what has become in Maximian research a virtual *locus classicus* on the reciprocal relationship between divine incarnation and human deification:

> For [the Fathers] say that God and man are paradigms one of another: God is humanised to man through love for humankind to the extent that man, enabled through love, deifies himself to God; and man is caught up noetically by God to what is unknown to the extent that he manifests God, who is invisible by nature, through the virtues.[1]

Modern scholars have commented extensively on this distinctive *tantum-quantum* (τοσοῦτον—ὅσον) formula,[2] noting its linguistic roots in Gregory Nazianzen[3] and conceptual roots in Athanasius[4] and Irenaeus.[5] In Maximus' spiritual theology it expresses with especial clarity the directness of the reciprocity between divine incarnation and human deification—most particularly, it should be noted, in the specific context not of the historic

---

[1] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1113BC). Reading τὸ ἄγνωστον with Polycarp Sherwood ('The Earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and His Refutation of Origenism', *Studia Anselmiana* 36 (Rome: Herder, 1955), 144, fn 35) in place of τὸ γνωστόν. In my translation of sources in this paper, I have freely consulted existing translations and amended them where I have considered it appropriate.

[2] See, among others, Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie* (Einsiedeln: Johannes-Verlag, 1961), 277-278; Lars Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor* (2nd edition, Chicago: Open Court, 1995), 31-32; Jean-Claude Larchet, *La divinisation de l'homme selon saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996), 376-382.

[3] *Or* 29.19; 40.45.

[4] *De inc.* 54.

[5] *Ad haer.* 3.19.1.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

incarnation, but of the ascetic life of the Christian.[6] The deification of the human person is directly proportionate to, and constituted by, the humanisation of the divine Word, who became incarnate historically in Christ. Deification takes place when the invisible God again takes on visible contours in the virtues, thereby becoming manifest in the world in an ongoing, escalating cycle of revelation. Love (ἀγάπη), which on the divine side is enacted in the form of φιλανθρωπία,[7] constitutes the essential ingredient that makes this transformative, unifying, and revelatory process possible.

But my primary interest in starting with this passage is not so much to point out this reciprocity than to note its transformational, *theophanous* effect upon the human body—an effect suggested by the words immediately following. Just prior to this passage, Maximus had described the spiritual *diabasis* of the soul from sense through reason up to mind, through which the saints become united 'wholly' to God. Then in the words that follow, he makes passing reference to the impact of this process upon 'the nature of the body'. '[A]ccording to this philosophy,' he writes, 'the nature of the body is necessarily ennobled (εὐγενίζεται).'[8] The person 'caught up' (ἁρπάζεσθαι) in the process of deification becomes in the ordered totality of his corporeal human nature—a composite unity of mind (νοῦς), reason (λόγος) and sense (αἴσθησις), an agent of divine manifestation.

It is this necessarily corporeal character and locus of divine theophany, one paralleled in scripture and cosmos, that I shall endeavour to explore further in this essay. In doing so, I wish to draw attention to the 'structural dynamics' of Maximus' account of revelation, that is, the overall shape of revelation as a progressive and interactive movement and the corresponding role of the symbolic and the sensible. This is a theme we encounter elsewhere in his *œuvre*, most notably in the great anti-Origenist work, *Ambiguum* 7,[9] where, among other things, Maximus is at pains to demon-

---

[6] *Ep.* 2 (PG 91.401AB); *Amb.Io.* 7 (PG 91.1084C); *Amb.Io.* 60 (PG 91.1385C); *Amb.Th.* 3 (PG 91.1040CD).

[7] In her important study *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), Catherine Osborne has demonstrated convincingly the association of φιλανθρωπία as it is understood by Origen and Dionysius the Areopagite with God's love exercised in the economy of the incarnation (164-200). Already in Origen she detects the presence of an 'inverse symmetry' between human assimilation to God through love and God's love for humankind (182), one that is not unlike the reciprocity involved in the *tantum-quantum* idea of Maximus.

[8] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1113C; see also PG 91.1116D).

[9] PG 91.1068D-1101C.

strate that it is precisely *within* the material structure and temporal contingencies of the cosmos that there can be discerned the providential and gracious presence of a good God. And while for illustrative purposes it will prove useful to draw upon insights from other material, especially the discussion of the account of the Transfiguration in *Ambiguum* 10—which is for Maximus paradigmatic of the totality of God's economic engagement with creation—I shall confine myself largely to Maximus' early work, the *Chapters on Theology and the Economy*,[10] for it consciously presents in pithy, accessible form the concentrated distillation of subjects addressed in the longer treatises.

1. *Apophasis and Kataphasis: the Structure of Revelation*

It seems prudent, when studying Maximus' *Chapters on Theology*—a work whose literary genre apparently favours the random conglomeration of unrelated parts—to begin by assuming its integrity as a unit before analysing its individual parts. But having said this, I should like to attempt to identify its primary theme by beginnning at its end. It is perhaps not so unusual to do so, since Maximus himself, adopting the Aristotelean teleological view of nature, habitually analysed the apparently endless diversity and chaotic randomness of the cosmos in terms of its ultimate unitive goal (*telos*).[11] And for all their theological, philosophical, and literary complexities, I would argue that these 200 diverse *capita* are united in their goal to lead their monastic readership to a stance of reverent praise and adoration in the face of the acknowledged incomprehensibility of God. It is the final three chapters, whose lines are replete with images of vocal praise and sensual experience of God, that leads me to suspect as much.

In 2.98, Maximus interprets the words of Psalm 101:1-2, 'I will sing and be wise in a blameless path when you come to me,' as that praise and experience of the divine advent that come about through ascetic struggle and gnostic understanding. In 2.99, having noted the dual necessity of keeping God's commands through both positive action ('goodness') and negative ('remembrance of the divine judgements'), Maximus introduces another Psalm verse, 'I will sing of your *mercy* and *judgement*, O Lord' (Psalm

---

[10] *Capita theologica et oeconomica*, hereon called the *Chapters on Theology* and abbreviated as *Th.Oec.* The Greek text is Migne's reprint in *Patrologia Graeca* of F. Combefis' 1675 edition (PG 90.1084-1173).

[11] *Amb.Io.* 7 (PG 91.1072BC); *Myst.* 1-2.

100:1), 'so that gladdened by *desire* he may address God, and being muzzled by *fear* he may be well-tuned for song.'[12] And finally in 2.100, the one who unites his body and soul through virtue and knowledge is said to become 'a lyre and flute and temple':

> A lyre, because he beautifully guards the harmony of the virtues; a flute, because through the divine visions he receives the Spirit's inspiration; and a temple since, by virtue of intellectual purity, he has become the Word's dwelling place.

Following his revered master Gregory Nazianzen, Maximus here affirms that the proper way to speak of God is not with chit-chat and conjecture, but with reverence and praise.[13] The psalter too, ends in praise, and there are echoes here of St Paul's doxology in Romans 11:33-36, for it is a similar kind of contemplation of God's acts of judgement and salvation that elicits the final doxological response. With this consummate doxological image of desire (πόθος) tempered and rendered harmonious by fear (φόβος),[14] it would be tantalising to see Maximus' purpose throughout the *Chapters on Theology* as being somehow conditioned by his desire to engage his readership in a spiritual enterprise that leads not to a theological agnosticism where one finally has nothing to say of God, but to that heavenly ἐξομολόγησις that is the true *telos* of the Christian life. If true, this would present a significant hermeneutical key for understanding Maximus' often-times radical apophaticism. It would suggest that negative theology functions as a presupposition whose purpose is affirmation and praise. It would suggest that there is something positive, substantial, even *corporeal* that belongs in an epistemological and ascetical schema often more well-known for negation and an almost iconoclastic suspicion of corporeality.

But that is not how the *Chapters on Theology* begin. Turning back now to the opening chapters, we are confronted at the outset by a series of ten

---

[12] In his translation, Berthold, I believe, misses the sense of the contrast in this passage between the effects of πόθος and φόβος (*Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings* (Classics of Western Spirituality, New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 170). Πόθος gives rise to intimacy and confidence; φόβος, in effecting silence and retreat, does not so much 'furnish a mouth' than 'silence the mouth.'

[13] Greg. Naz. *Or.* 27.1-5; 28.1-5. In *Q.Thal.* 55, Maximus allows conjecture only if it leads to one of two possibilities: praise and thanks, or reverent silence (*CCSG* 22, 481.26-483.36).

[14] Πόθος and φόβος are a favourite pair for Maximus that in unconfused union form the necessary characteristics of true love. See, for example, the opening paragraph of *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 27.8-28.29).

paragraphs of a strongly apophatic, philosophical character. Here Maximus furnishes an outline of the key assertions of a theological epistemology conditioned by negation (ἀπόφασις), thereby setting out the dominant themes he develops throughout the work:

> God is one, without beginning, incomprehensible, possessing in his totality the full power of being, fully excluding the notion of time and quality in that he is inaccessible to all and not discernible by any being on the basis of any natural representation.
>
> God is in himself (insofar as it is possible for us to know) neither beginning, nor middle, nor end, nor absolutely anything that is thought of as coming after him by nature; for he is unlimited, unmoved, and infinite in that he is infinitely beyond every essence, power, and act.[15]

As scholars have recognised since von Balthasar's analysis of the *Chapters on Theology* in his *Kosmische Liturgie*,[16] these opening ten chapters form a unit containing Maximus' forceful refutation of Origenist metaphysics, couched in the apophatic terminology of the two Gregories[17] and Pseudo-Dionysius.[18] With God as he is in himself, both ontological definitions and epistemological lines of enquiry fall short: the God who is beyond being is by definition also beyond knowing. Classic triads such as *beginning—middle—end*, or *essence—power—energy*, adapted from Aristotelean metaphysics, are ruled out as inadequate ways of speaking of God, who transcends all temporal, kinetic, and spatial categories.

We may be tempted by the complexity of the subject matter and the technicality of the vocabulary to think that we are dealing only with a rather abstract series of propositions on divine ontology and epistemology. Yet we cannot go beyond the first ten chapters without noting several features that pertain to our enquiry. First there is the use at the very end of the unit of Romans 11:36, 'from him and through him and to him are all things,' an affirmation which in its immediate setting suggests the inherently doxological goal of negative theology. One *can* speak of God as beginning, middle, and end—not in that he suffers (πάσχων) them in himself, but in that he effects (ἐνεργῶν) them in the things that have being. 'He is

---

[15] *Th.Oec.* 1.1-2.

[16] *Kosmische Liturgie*, 482-643. Also Sherwood, 'The Earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and His Refutation of Origenism', 106-109.

[17] Greg. Naz., *Or.* 28.3, 6, 9, 11, 17, 38; Greg. Nyss. *Contra Eunom.* 2.61, 105, 130, 142, 192; *De vita Moysis* 2.158, 162, 163, 180, 188.

[18] *De divinis nominibus* (*DN*) 1 (PG 3.588A; 588C); *Ep.* 1 (PG 3.1065A); *Ep.* 2 (PG 3.1068A-1069A).

beginning as creator, middle as provider, and end as final boundary, for as it says, "from him, and through him, and to him are all things."'[19] The doxological formula substantiates a theological *affirmation*.

What allows Maximus to affirm something of the God who transcends all positive affirmation? We must remember that he was thoroughly acquainted with, and indeed, directly utilising the theological apophaticism anticipated by the Cappadocians,[20] and expressed unequivocally in Dionysius:

> His transcendent darkness remains hidden from all light and concealed from all knowledge. Someone beholding God and understanding what he saw has not actually seen God himself but rather something of his which has being and which is knowable. For he himself utterly transcends mind and being. He is completely unknown and non-existent. He exists beyond being and is known beyond the mind.[21]

The answer to our question surely lies in pointing out that only when Maximus has fully *denied* the possibility of any natural means of access to knowledge of God on the one hand, and the inherent limitations of that believing brought about by the contemplation of the *logoi* in creation on the other, is he able to introduce the possibility of faith which, as a divine gift, gains access to the unknowable God in a way that far transcends all natural faculties:[22]

> It is said that all beings are objects of knowledge because they bear the demonstrable principles of their knowledge. God, however, is called the unknown, and among all knowable things he is believed only 'to be'. That is why no knowable object can compare in any way with him.

---

[19] *Th.Oec.* 1.10; Rom 11:36a.

[20] This statement comes with the qualification that the presence of apophaticism in the Cappadocians, particularly Gregory of Nyssa, ought not to be underestimated. See Robert Brightman, 'Apophatic Theology and Divine Infinity in St. Gregory of Nyssa.' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 18 (1973), 97-114. One may also consider the rise of anchoritic monasticism in the 4th century a kind of dramatic parallel of the increasing emergence of a Christian consciousness that theology-as-prayer is properly articulated and lived out only within the tension—eschatologically oriented—created by negation and affirmation. See further Kallistos Ware, 'The Way of the Ascetics: Positive or Negative?' in Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis (eds.), *Asceticism* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 3-15.

[21] *Ep.* 1 (PG 3.1065AB).

[22] Von Balthasar observes that Maximus' high estimation of πίστις in these chapters is demonstrable in that he calls it 'authentic knowledge' (ἀληθὴς γνῶσις), going beyond Dionysius' conception of faith as that which revolves around knowledge of all things (*Kosmische Liturgie*, 605-606).

> The knowledge of beings includes naturally, in view of demonstration, knowledge of their own principles which naturally circumscribe them in a definition. But God, through the principles in beings, is believed only 'to be'. He gives to the godly a proper confession and faith which are clearer than every demonstration. For faith is a true knowledge which bears the undemonstrated principles, since it is the concrete actuality (ὑπόστασις) of realities that are beyond mind and reason.[23]

Viewed then within its wider setting in the *Chapters on Theology*, the exclamation from Romans 11:36 does more than simply connect doxology with κατάφασις. It is only on the basis of faith—which as the first step in the Pauline triad leads through hope to its perfection in love[24]—that one can and indeed must speak of God within the limitations of human speech. God's inscrutability leads to confession and praise. *Apophasis* and *kataphasis* are two sides of the same coin.[25]

This fact is further demonstrated by way of a second observation made by George Berthold when he noted the almost creedal form of this opening section in its use of the confession 'God is one'.[26] Later we find the exact repetition of this phrase in a passage that qualifies the strong apophaticism of 1.1-10 with an overtly trinitarian confession.[27] Has Maximus in this second semi-creedal formulation again abandoned the primacy of the *via negativa*? Given the deliberate placement of the paragraph that follows, it would appear that he wants to hold both affirmation and negation together in inseparable unity:

> Every concept involves those who think and what is thought, subject and object. But God is neither of those who think nor of what is thought for he is beyond them. Otherwise he would be limited if as a thinker he stood in need of the relationship to what was thought or as an object of thought he would naturally lapse to the level of subject thinking through a relationship. Thus there remains only the rejoinder that *God is neither of those things that conceive, nor of those things that are conceived, but is beyond [all] these things.*[28]

---

[23] *Th.Oec.* 1.8-9. Cf. Hebrews 11:1.

[24] See *Ep.* 2 (PG 91.396BC).

[25] On this point, it is interesting to note the use of Romans 11:33-36 in Dionysius (*DN* 1.2; 4.9; 7.1; *Ep.* 5). God's unknowability is an attribute worthy of praise.

[26] 'The Cappadocian Roots of Maximus the Confessor', in Felix Heinzer and Christoph Schönborn (eds.), *Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2-5 septembre 1980* (Éditions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1982), 55.

[27] *Th.Oec.* 2.1. See further, 'The Cappadocian Roots', 55-56.

[28] *Th.Oec.* 2.2.

What we seem to be encountering at the beginning of both sets of 100 chapters is a paradoxical dialectic between affirmation and negation, one that itself reflects the interplay and inherent connection between *theologia* and *economia*.[29] Human reason stands before God speechless, for he is beyond all knowing and speculation. He is neither subject or object, and therefore not only is he beyond human scrutiny as object, but also beyond the status of subject as one who addresses and acts upon humans as objects. The impact of this utter ineffability of God extends even to the super-human creatures, including the angels, and completely excludes any mediated accessibility in the form of emanation. As Maximus asserts in a later passage, 'The knowledge of [God] in himself, both in essence (οὐσία) and person (ὑπόστασις), remains inaccessible to all angels and humans alike: he is unknown to anyone by any means.'[30]

This primary epistemological impasse confronts the would-be contemplative with shocking force. Negative theology is discovered to be a spiritual experience rather than an epistemological method.[31] It is Maximus' intention to bring that experience about in his readers, for the *sententiae* form of the *Chapters on Theology* is essentially interactive and performative in nature, designed in structure and use not so much to provide philosophical data, as to lead to transfiguring engagement with the God hidden in *theologia* and revealed in *economia*. It is the paradoxical reciprocity between denial of God's knowability on the one hand, and affirmation of his knowability through faith on the other that Maximus commends as the

---

[29] Andrew Louth refers to the same dynamic at work in his analysis of the *Mystagogia* and *Ambiguum* 10: 'The movement between apophatic and kataphatic is not a matter of a dialectic between two kinds of human logic in speaking of God; rather, it is a movement between God's own hidden life and his engagement with his creation. . . .' (*Wisdom of the Byzantine Church: Evagrios of Pontos and Maximos the Confessor* (Jill Raitt (ed.), 1997 Paine Lectures in Religion, Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri), 42. While I concur with Ysabel De Andia who argues that, in contrast to Dionysius, Maximus posits a far more christocentric relation between negative and affirmative theology, *theologia* and *economia* ('Transfiguration et Théologie Négative Chez Maxime le Confesseur et Denys L'Aréopagite', in Ysabel de Andia (ed.), *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa Postérité en Orient et en Occident. Actes du Colloque International. Paris, 21-24 septembre 1994* (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes), 309), I feel that her contrasts are drawn rather too sharply.

[30] *Th.Oec.* 2.76.

[31] Pierre Hadot draws a similar conclusion for Greek philosophy in general when he says that 'it is mystical experience that founds negative theology, not the reverse.' Quoted by Arnold I. Davidson in Arnold I. Davidson (ed.) and Michael Chase (trans.), *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995), 29.

basic structure of divine revelation, and thus the presupposition of all true ascetic transformation. Yet it is not only the start, as we have seen, but also the way. As Berthold puts it, '. . . the revelation of God as Trinity is one which both reduces the human mind to apophatic silence and calls it to a life of divine intimacy.'[32] It seems that Maximus wants his readers to understand the ascetic life as a continual movement of increasing illumination in union with, and in praise of the economic trinity, by means of negation, disillusionment, and unknowing.

So far we have traced the outline of a structure of revelation in Maximus' *Chapters on Theology* that closely conforms to the pattern of divine descent and ascent by way of affirmation and negation in the Areopagite. Maximus envisages the ascetic life in terms of an ongoing engagement between these paradoxes of negation and affirmation, of a theological unknowing and an economic knowing, of ignorance and faith, of silence and praise. Between these poles we discern a basic pattern of thinking, and, more than that, a pattern of the human (non)experience of the divine. This in turn leads us to ask how this pattern works itself out in the Christian life. The *Chapters on Theology* outline a basic structure of revelation. But where and how does this two-way structure intersect corporeal human existence? What does it look like? What are its 'corporeal contours'—that is, its modes and media? In answering this question, we come now to qualify more carefully the place and function of corporeality within a revelatory framework characterised by negation and affirmation.

2. *Revelation as Interactive Process*

Perhaps the best place to start for an understanding of how revelation works out in human experience is not with Maximus at all, but with Dionysius the Areopagite. In Dionysius we have already encountered a multi-dimensional understanding of revelation built around the twin doxological actions of affirmation and negation. Dionysius calls it the 'double way' of sacred revelation.[33] To these ways there correspond a number of elements, largely expressed in categories borrowed from Neoplatonism: procession and return, descent and ascent, diffusion and union. But far from forming a dry, metaphysical system, these categories are employed to describe a pedagogical process that has its initiative and power in the benevolence of God:

---

[32] 'The Cappadocian Roots', 58.

[33] *De caelesti hierarchia* (*CH*) 2.3.

> Many scripture writers will tell you that the divinity is not only invisible and incomprehensible, but also 'unsearchable and inscrutable', since there is not a trace for anyone who would reach through into the hidden depths of this infinity. And yet, on the other hand, the Good is not absolutely incommunicable to everything. By itself it generously reveals a firm, transcendent beam, granting enlightenments proportionate to each being, and thereby draws sacred minds upward to its permitted contemplation, to participation and to the state of becoming like it. What happens to those that rightly and properly make this effort is this. They do not venture toward an impossibly daring sight of God, one beyond what is duly granted them. Nor do they go tumbling downward where their own natural inclinations would take them. No. Instead they are raised firmly and unswervingly upward in the direction of the ray which enlightens them. With a love matching the illuminations granted them, they take flight, reverently, wisely, in all holiness.[34]

This paragraph directs us toward a conception of revelation as an interactive dialectic that heads towards the re-unification of both divine and human subjects. Inherent to this dialectic is the paradoxical nature of revelation. God reveals himself by hiding himself, and in hiding himself, he is known. In this sense, we can never speak of revelation without also speaking of concealment.[35]

Turning to Maximus, we find similar aspects present in his thought. We have already observed the dynamism inherent in the dialectic of affirmation and negation with its accompanying paradox of revelation and concealment. Both give shape to a progressive movement of the Logos that proceeds downwards and outwards into creation, draws creation into its movement through man, and then culminates in return towards the unity of the Godhead. It is a movement from unity to diversity and back to unity; from simplicity to complexity back to simplicity.[36] Yet it becomes clear in Maximus that, in opposition to the equilibrium implied in the Origenist pristine and final states, the final dynamic state of unity and simplicity is quite different from the first, for restored and deified human nature contains within itself the healed, reconciled fragments of creation, united to God in infinite, perpetual progress.[37]

---

[34] *DN* 1.2 (trans. by Colm Luibheid, in Colm Luibheid and Paul Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works* Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist press, 1987), 50).

[35] See Dionysius *CH* 2.2; *Ep.* 3; Maximus *Amb.Th.* 5 (PG 91.1049A).

[36] This theme is expounded upon at length in *Amb.Io.* 10 (*PG* 91.1177B-1180A) in which Maximus draws upon the Aristotelean categories of expansion (διαστολή) and contraction (συστολή) to describe a movement in being from universals, to particulars, and back to universals.

[37] *Amb.Io.* 7 (PG 91.1089B); 41 (PG 91.1304D-1305B); *Ep.* 2 (PG 91.404D). See

Creation then can be seen, on the basis of its penetration by the Logos, to be a central and crucial entity in this revelatory movement. It is precisely as, or *because* material creation is 'caught up' as an object of potential union with the Logos that its role as a medium of divine revelation becomes possible.[38] That which the Logos penetrates in order to unify with himself necessarily becomes an agent of the revelatory process. Creation constitutes the 'stuff' of revelation, and therefore we must add, of *concealment.* To those without eyes to see, creation hides God. To this is connected, on equal par, Maximus' understanding of scripture. Creation and scripture—the natural and historical laws—are symbolised for Maximus by the shining garments of the transfigured Christ, rendered transparent to the purified vision of the three apostles.[39] Paul Blowers has convincingly demonstrated this in his study of *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, concluding that Maximus 'envisions creation and scripture as objective economies of divine revelation that stand in a perfect analogous relation to the Logos-Revealer.'[40] Yet Maximus does not extend to creation a lesser role than scripture in the revelatory structure. As he asserts in *Ambiguum* 10, 'the two laws—both the natural law and the written law—are of equal honour and teach the same things; neither is greater or less than the other.'[41] Or as Blowers has it, 'nature and history are equal poles that complement one another eschatologically.'[42]

Since the unknowability of God forms the basic presupposition of theological knowledge, by which we mean not simply knowledge *that* God is, but the knowledge of faith that leads to union with him, then the initiative and sustaining power of the revelatory process must reside in God. If the fallen human mind has no access to knowledge of God, then it is entirely dependent upon God's self-revelation for its knowledge and apprehension of him. But God's point of access to the human mind, if we can speak this way, is not direct—at least not in the first instance. As we have shown above, the revelatory movement of the Logos is mediated via created, sensible realities: nature and history.

---

further Paul Plass, 'Moving Rest in Maximus the Confessor', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 35 (1984), 177-190; Paul M. Blowers, 'Maximus the Confessor, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Concept of "Perpetual Progress"', *Vigiliae Christianae* 46 (1992), 151-171.

[38] God's great works and providence, evident in creation, function as mirrors of divine goodness, wisdom, and power. See *Car.* 1.96.

[39] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1128A-D).

[40] *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy in Maximus the Confessor: An Investigation of the* Quaestiones ad Thalassium, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 102.

[41] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1128D).

[42] *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 102.

The following passage speaks of revelation in terms of divine action: condescension, lifting up, and illumination. That comes as no surprise. But in view of what we have said, it is the tactility of this encounter that is worthy of note:

> The soul would never be able to reach out and attain to the knowledge of God, *unless God himself*, having drawn near to it, touch (ἅψηται) it by condescension and lead it up to himself; for the human mind has no such power to ascend, to apprehend any divine illumination as it were, *unless God himself* draw it up—as [far as] the human mind is able to be drawn up—and [himself] illumine it with divine brightness.[43]

Here again we detect the familiar movement of divine descent and human ascent, which constitutes the basic structure of revelation. Primary is the necessity of God's condescension (συγκατάβασις), whereby 'God himself' comes near and 'touches' the soul. The reference is deliberately incarnational, yet it is expressed here not as a historically distant event, but as an intimate encounter in the flesh and blood life of a member of the Christian community. Through this touch, God leads the soul back up (ἀνάγειν) to himself—its true source and goal. The use of the word ἀνάγειν in this context is to be noted, as it often occurs in Dionysius coupled with 'return' (ἐπιστροφή), and plays an important role in the Areopagite's understanding of the human ascent to God by means of the symbolic revelatory media.[44]

To summarise, the fulfilment of revelation as a process is the result of a progressive, and dynamic engagement between the Logos as the source and agent of illumination and the receptive human mind in ordered harmony within the context of the economies of creation and scripture. The initial point of contact between divine and human subjects is sensible, mediate, and diverse. The final state of union to which the process leads is intelligible, immediate, and simple.

3. *The Incarnation and the Apprehension of Revelation*

We come now to consider more specifically the place of the incarnate Logos in this scheme. It is in Maximus' meditations on the synoptic account of the Transfiguration that we can trace most clearly his dialectical theol-

---

[43] *Th.Oec.* 1.31.

[44] See further Paul Rorem, *Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984), 99-105.

ogy of revelation at work. The following section from *Ambiguum* 10 demonstrates his thinking on the event.[45]

> While I do not wish to appear to any more long-winded than is necessary, I think that there appears to us yet another great and divine mystery from [this account of] the divine Transfiguration, more radiant than what I have said before. I think that the divine-fitting drama (τὰ θεοπρεπῆ δραματουργήματα) enacted upon the mountain of Transfiguration mystically demonstrates (ὑφηγεῖσθαι) the two universal modes of theology.[46]

Maximus does not at this point mention the Logos. It seems that his aim is initially to provide an outline of the structure of revelation that serves to instruct his readers into the proper way of apprehending the mystery of Christ. The two 'modes' are already familiar to us. First he sets out the way of negation, which paradoxically 'affirms' (καταφάσκειν) and 'amplifies' (σεμνύνειν) the divine transcendence: '[First there is] the antecedent and simple and uncaused, which through singular and total negation truly affirms the divine, and which through speechlessness necessarily amplifies its transcendence.' Then follows the way of affirmation, in which we discern the necessary place of the corporeal and symbolic: '[Then there is] that which follows this and is composite, which through affirmation magnificently sketches out [the divine] from those things that are caused.'[47] His conclusion affirms the integrity of both apophatic and kataphatic theology as a bi-unitive whole: 'By these, as far as it is humanly possible, the overarching knowledge about God and the divine things leads us through the symbols suitably adapted to us to both these modes [of theology].'[48]

---

[45] It should be noted that by supplementing Maximus' treatment of the Transfiguration in the *Chapters on Theology* with this examination of *Ambiguum* 10, I am aware of the danger of conflating two quite distinct expressions of thought in Maximus on the role of Christ in revelation. Polycarp Sherwood has dated the two works as nearly contemporaneous (the earlier *Ambigua* c. 628-30; *Chapters of Theology* c. 630-34; see 'An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor,' *Studia Anselmiana* 30 (Rome: Herder, 1952), 31-35). Nevertheless, it is in *Ambiguum* 10, far more definitively than in the *Chapters on Theology*, that Maximus asserts the centrality of the incarnate Logos as the focal paradigm and means of a universal divine revelation, to the extent that, as Andrew Louth indicates, 'in the Incarnate One, all the forms of God's revelation are summed up and become comprehensible.' (*Maximus the Confessor* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 71.)

[46] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165B).

[47] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165B).

[48] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165BC).

Using terminology that is frequently repeated in his other discussions on the Transfiguration, Maximus goes on to speak of the didactic and educative nature of knowledge gained through material symbols.[49] We have come across this pedagogical aspect of revelation with Dionysius in the previous section. Far from being a peripheral issue, the pedagogical character and purpose of revelation could be said to constitute a dominant motif. We detect this fact as Maximus applies this two-fold dialectical structure of revelation, pedagogically conceived, to Christ:

> Let us consider whether in each of the above-mentioned modes the symbol is appropriately and wisely constituted according to that divine Transfiguration of the Lord. For he accepted to be created in form like us without change, and through his immeasurable love for humankind (φιλανθρωπία) to become the type and symbol of himself, and from himself symbolically to exemplify himself, and through his appearing to lead the whole creation to himself [in his] invisible and complete hiddenness. And while he remains quite unknown in his hidden, secret place beyond all things, unable to be known or understood by any being in any way whatsoever, out of his love for humankind (φιλανθρώπως) he grants to human beings intimations of himself in the manifest divine works (τὰς θεουργίας) performed through the flesh.[50]

In the *Chapters on Theology*, we recognise the same scheme at work. As the φιλάνθρωπος,[51] the Logos initially gives himself to people according to their limited, sense-oriented means of apprehension. Thus Maximus says that the 'first encounter' (πρώτη προσβολή) with the Logos is with his flesh—with his incarnate, veiled form.[52] The reference occurs within a rather profound series of chapters that meditate upon the contrast between the Lord's presence and absence experienced respectively as 'face to face' vision and vision 'as in a mirror' (1 Corinthians 13:12).[53] Maximus considers each of these categories in connection with the progression from the active to the contemplative life.

> The Lord is sometimes absent, sometimes present. He is absent in terms of face to face vision; he is present in terms of vision in a mirror and in enigmas.

---

[49] Παιδεύειν with its cognates dominates the educative vocabulary in Maximus' exegesis of scripture. See, for example, *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1128A; 1160D-1161A). Significantly, the verbs παιδεύειν and διδάσκειν are often juxtaposed with, and therefore appear to occupy an equivalent semantic field to verbs of demonstration and visual manifestation (δείκνυμι, ἐπιφαίνομαι, ὑφηγέομαι).

[50] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1165D-1168A).

[51] *Th.Oec.* 2.56. See also *Q.Thal.* 48 (PG 90.433B).

[52] *Th.Oec.* 2.60.

[53] *Th.Oec.* 2.57-61.

> To the active person, the Lord is present through the virtues, but absent to him who takes no account of the reason of virtue. And again, to the contemplative he is present through the true knowledge of the things that are, but absent to him who somehow misses it.[54]

The apprehension of the Lord, even by dim reflection, is conditioned by the spiritual state and progress of the subject. The manifestation of the Logos is not univocal. It is, crassly put, personally tailored according to the receptivity of the human party in such a way as to advance them from knowledge of the Logos' flesh to knowledge of his 'glory'.[55]

As one ascends the progressive steps of the spiritual life from letter to spirit, from words to the Word, and, given the context, we can add from *praxis*[56] to *theoria*, one moves from dependence upon material symbols to a more direct apprehension of the subject they disclose. Indeed, 'the saints', that is, the characters and writers of scripture, represent the highest way of apprehending divine knowledge when it is said of them that 'they do not acquire the blessed knowledge of God only by sense and appearances and forms, using letters and syllables, which lead to mistakes and bafflement over the judgement of the truth, but solely by the mind, rendered most pure and released from all material mists.'[57]

In following Maximus' distinctions between various levels or stages in the revelatory process, we must keep in mind the integrative unity between the two realms of *praxis* and *theoria*, a unity Maximus repeatedly asserts over against an unhealthy preoccupation with one to the exclusion of the other. In 2.37-39 for instance, Maximus makes a point he demonstrates more fully elsewhere,[58] namely, the essential co-inherence of the ascetic and contemplative dimensions of the spiritual life.[59] He links them

---

[54] *Th.Oec.* 2.57-58.

[55] *Th.Oec.* 2.61.

[56] By the term *praxis*, Maximus invariably has in mind ascetic struggle in its Palestinian and Byzantine monastic forms. Following Evagrius the primary term is πρακτική.

[57] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1160B).

[58] *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1145AB); *Amb.Io.* 57 (PG 91.1380D-1381B); *Q.Thal.* 3 (*CCSG* 7, 55.17-22); *Q.Thal.* 58 (PG 90.596A): 'In my view, practice (πρᾶξις) and contemplation (θεωρία) mutually cohere with each other, and the one is never separated from the other; on the contrary, practice shows forth through conduct the knowledge derived from contemplation, while contemplation, no less than reason, fortifies itself with the virtue derived from practice.' (trans. by Paul M. Blowers, *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 134.)

[59] This principle surfaces repeatedly in the *Chapters on Theology*. See, for instance, 1.98; 2.32; 2.37; 2.40; 2.51; 2.64; 2.74; 2.80; 2.87.

respectively with the two epistemological categories of *kataphasis* and *apophasis*, which in turn are aspects of the self-manifestation of the Word in the flesh on the one hand, and the *transitus* from the Word-made-flesh to the spiritual Word in its pre-incarnate form on the other:

> In the active life, the Word—becoming thick by means of the virtues—becomes flesh. Whereas in the contemplative life—becoming lean by spiritual thoughts, it becomes what it was in the beginning: God the Word.
>
> He makes the Word flesh who engages in the ethical teaching of the Word through more elementary examples and words in view of the corresponding potential of the hearers; and again, he makes the Word spirit who expounds mystical theology through sublime visions.
>
> He who makes theological affirmations kataphatically makes the Word flesh—having nothing other than what can be seen or felt in order to know God as cause. But he who makes theological negations apophatically makes the Word spirit, as in the beginning he was God and was with God—having absolutely nothing of what can be known, [yet] knowing well the unknowable.

At the same time, there remains an ordered tension between the two dimensions of *praxis/theoria*, flesh/spirit, kataphaticism/apophaticism, and in the two chapters that follow, Maximus warns against a carnal sensuality severed from its proper *taxis*.[60] Both dimensions are seen to exist in a natural harmony only within a dynamic order of priority in which *praxis* is subordinate to *theoria*, affirmation to negation, the sensible to the spiritual. This order has as its paradigm the historical descent and return of the divine Word, in which is manifest the salvific nature of the movement from affirmation to negation towards teleological unity.

The clear *theological* priority of *theoria* over *praxis* also seems to have its basis in the thought that *theoria* is the realm towards which *praxis* naturally heads.[61] In other words, the relation between the two dimensions, as with the relation between letter and spirit in Scripture and sensible and insensible in creation, is viewed eschatologically.[62] This perspective is shaped by

---

[60] *Th.Oec.* 2.41-42.

[61] While thoroughly conditioned by eschatological considerations, this priority is not to be thought of in chronological and temporal terms. Rather it may be seen as an extension of an ontological priority in Platonism of the spiritual and simple over the material and composite. See the important comments of Cornelia J. De Vogel in her essay 'Platonism and Christianity: a Mere Antagonism or a Profound Common Ground?', *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985), 25-26.

[62] This is not at all dissimilar to the Pauline distinction between the outer/visible and inner/invisible life in 2 Corinthians 4:16-18, the first of which is temporal, the latter of which is eternal, though already apprehended under the form of tribulation.

the nature of the incarnation of the Logos himself, discussed in the first paragraph below, and by the nature of its apprehension, discussed in the second:

> The Word of God is called flesh not only as having become incarnate, but in the manner of being understood simply as God the Word 'in the beginning with God' the Father, where, possessing both clear and naked forms of the truth about all things, he does not contain parables or riddles or have need of allegorical stories. When he becomes present to people who are unable to apprehend naked thoughts with naked intelligence, he 'becomes flesh' by presenting himself through the multiplicity of stories and riddles and parables and dark sayings. For in the first encounter (κατὰ τὴν πρώτην προσβολήν), our mind does not apprehend the naked Word, but the Word incarnate, indeed, in a multiplicity of verbal forms, for while he is Word by nature, he is flesh to the sight. The result is that the multitude (οἱ πολλοί) think they see 'flesh' and not the Word, even though he truly is the Word. For the inner meaning of Scripture (ὁ νοῦς τῆς Γραφῆς) is not what appears to the multitude, but something contrary to appearance (ἕτερον παρὰ τὸ δοκοῦν). For the Word 'becomes flesh' through each individual word.
>
> The beginning of human discipleship towards devotion generates the movement towards flesh. For in the first encounter (τὴν πρώτην προσβολήν) towards godliness we associate with the letter, but not the spirit. But gradually progressing in the spirit, cutting down the thickness of the words by more refined contemplations, we come to be purely in the pure Christ, as far as humanly possible. Then we can say with the Apostle, 'And if we have known Christ according to the flesh, we no longer know him', clearly meaning that due to the simple encounter with the Logos apart from the veils of the mind, we advance from knowing the Logos of 'flesh' to knowing his 'glory' as the only begotten from the Father.[63]

In typical Platonic fashion, Maximus distinguishes between true vision and the illusion of *hoi polloi*. True vision sees through externalities presented by the riddles and verbal forms of scripture to the 'naked Word' enclosed in them. The 'inner meaning' or 'mind'[64] of scripture is 'contrary to appearances'. Here we see the double-entendre of the incarnation noted earlier: the Word is concealed in revelation, and revealed in concealment.[65] The initial vision of individual words of scripture or the flesh of Christ presents only those material and sensible forms with which the naked Word has wrapped himself, not the Word himself. This is not simply an act of 'hide

---

[63] *Th.Oec.* 2.60-61.

[64] In *Th.Oec.* 2.60 the term is νοῦς; elsewhere Maximus also uses λόγος, θεωρία, σκοπός.

[65] See esp. *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1129A-1129C).

and seek' on his part, but the means by which he renders himself accessible to those who are unable to apprehend naked νοητά with their naked νοῦς. It is also the means by which he protects from defilement by the impure the mysterious sanctity of the content of revelation.[66] But the driving force behind each action is love, salvifically directed.

The passages studied here have made clear what could be called the notion of 'proportionate revelation.' Maximus is simply reflecting the basic patristic consensus reaching back to Origen,[67] and ultimately, to the scriptures, that divine gifts are distributed proportionately to each believer in a measure commensurate to their spiritual state. But followers of Christ are not simply neutral recipients of a proportionate revelation tailored to their spiritual or intellectual capacities. The divine gift—whether it be spoken of as faith, vision, grace, adoption—must be acted upon, put to work, exercised, guarded and preserved. At one point we find Maximus tracing the necessary movement from Christ's crucifixion through the tomb to resurrection. These events of the triduum are re-lived existentially in the ascetic progress of the saints. In a mysterious way, Christians hold in their hands the power either to crucify or to raise Christ, depending on the level of their progression in the spiritual life from *praxis* to *theoria*.[68] This is not to conclude that revelation is simply what one makes of it. Continual and progressive passage from flesh to spirit, from *praxis* to *theoria* is a both a moral and theological imperative in response to and in co-operation with the divine initiative.

One final example of the unified yet necessarily progressive nature of the anagogical process of apprehension at work is in order. Here Maximus begins by stating the problem in a way that suggests his solutions will head along trinitarian, or at least binitarian lines:

> As long we continue to see the Word of God embodied by means of riddles in the letter of holy Scripture, we have not beheld noetically the incorporeal and simple and singular and only Father as in the incorporeal and simple

---

[66] This is a dominant motif in Dionysius. See, for example, *CH* 2.2.

[67] *Contra Celsum* II.72: 'For the divine voice is such that it is heard only by those whom the speaker wishes to hear it. . . . And since when God speaks He does not want His voice to be audible to all, a man who has superior hearing hears God, whereas a man who has become hard of hearing in his soul does not perceive that God is speaking.' (trans. by Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), 121-122.) Also, on seeing/knowing God only by means of revelation and divine grace, see *Contra Celsum* VII. 42-44.

[68] *Th.Oec.* 2.27-30; 1.54; 1.59-67. Cf. Hebrews 6:6.

> and singular and only Son, as in the passage, 'he who has seen me has seen the Father,' and, 'I am in the Father and the Father is in me.'[69]

What, concretely, does it mean to 'see the Word of God embodied by means of riddles in the letter of holy scripture'? Maximus is clearly addressing an interpretive error, but the context suggests that its basic manifestation lies in the realm of the spiritual life. Over-preoccupation with *praxis* to the exclusion of *theoria* is evidence of a literalistic reading of scripture and the subsequent misapprehension of the Word disclosed and hidden there. Yet Maximus does not propose to do away with the letter of scripture, nor its correlatives: *praxis* and the flesh of Christ. To be sure, according to the principle of the incarnation, they constitute and remain the essential first step in the human ascent to God. He continues:

> Therefore, the need for further understanding is such that we must first pass through the veils of the letters that surround the Word, and thereby with a naked mind behold the pure Word himself as he exists in himself—as the one who clearly shows forth the Father in himself—as far as humanly possible. It is necessary for him who piously seeks after God not to hold fast to the letter, lest he unwittingly take words about God in place of God, that is, in place of the Word—precariously being content with the *words* of Scripture, while the *Word* escapes the mind through holding fast to the garments, all the while thinking it has the incorporeal Word. And like the Egyptian woman who took hold not of Joseph, but of his clothes, those who remain in the beauty alone of visible phenomena unwittingly worship in the manner of the ancients the creation instead of the Creator.[70]

It is appropriate at this point to try to summarise the main points of this section. The examples from Maximus elucidated above demonstrate the function of the pedagogical program of the Logos whereby he adapts himself to human beings at a level conducive to their intellectual (spiritual) capacities.[71] As we have seen, this is also where the human subject's involvement in the revelatory movement begins. If the involvement of the Logos is characterised by *pedagogy*, the involvement of the human person is char-

---

[69] *Th.Oec.* 2.73.

[70] *Th.Oec.* 2.73. The incident from Genesis 39:12 is utilised in a similar context in *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1129A-1133A). There the discussion revolves around the relation between divine revelation and concealment through corresponding means: creation, the words of holy scripture, the flesh of Christ, and his garments on the Mount of Transfiguration. These means are precisely that: means that are inseparable from, but not to be equated with, the content hidden and manifest in them.

[71] This thought is developed at length in a passage in *Amb.Io.* 10 (PG 91.1129A-1133A).

acterised by *anagogy*. By means of *anagogy*, one progresses from this 'fleshly' encounter with the Logos, which is not actually (finally) the Logos at all but with that which veils and covers his naked, pure form, and moves in stages of progressive disillusionment to the apprehension of the Logos as he is in his glorified form, as God, and as he was 'with God' before the creation of the world.[72] This movement is evident in a number of paradigms, all given definitive shape in the incarnation. They include the movement from the letter (ῥῆματα) or flesh (σάρξ) of scripture to its spirit, or meaning (λόγος), or mind (νοῦς); the movement from the active life to the contemplative;[73] from attention to the human and sensible to the divine and insensible;[74] verbal discourse to wordless contemplation;[75] from being beginners to being perfect. These anagogical movements also find a parallel in the historical movement from Old Testament to New Testament. Yet it is always a case of holding these dimensions together. Just as one never 'graduates' from ascetic struggle so that it no longer plays any part in the contemplative life, so one is never able to do without the Word made flesh, the letter of scripture, the cross and tomb. These, of course, are not the final (teleological) reality: they veil or conceal what is finally only made manifest in the Spirit, in the meaning of scripture, in the resurrection and ascension, and in the final consummation. The latter are hidden in and under the former as under types and symbols.[76] Yet they remain with the naked, glorified Logos, just as Moses and Elijah remain alongside Jesus in his transfiguration.[77]

As we have been studying the movement from apprehending the Word in the 'flesh' to knowing him in his 'glory', it has been possible also to detect lines suggesting answers to the question concerning the final goal or aim of revelation. We shall now explore this further.

---

[72] John 1:1.

[73] *Th.Oec.* 1.99.

[74] *Th.Oec.* 2.18.

[75] *Th.Oec.* 1.83.

[76] It is worth adding in this connection the observation of I.-H. Dalmais that '[e]n préférant la dialectique préparation-réalisation à l'antithèse figure-réalité, Maxime se donne le double avantage de nouer plus fortement l'unité de sa synthèse en y introduisant explicitement la dimension de la durée, et de réserver une place au devenir à l'intérieur de la nouvelle Alliance.' ('La Manifestation du Logos dans L'Homme et dans L'Église: Typologie anthropologique et typologie ecclésiale d'après *Qu.Thal.* 60 et *la Mystagogie*', in Heinzer and Schönborn, *Maximus Confessor: Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur*, 21. This is to be seen in congruity with the unification in Maximus of an historical-eschatological and a metaphysical interpretive framework.

[77] *Th.Oec.* 2.14.

4. *Theologia and Doxologia: The Goal of Revelation*

We began the first chapter of this essay by investigating the doxological character of theological (non)knowledge of the transcendent God. Now towards the end we return to that theme, following the structure of revelation marked for us by Maximus' own theological vision. In the previous section we have seen how, in a series of chapters that have already formed the object of some attention,[78] Maximus deals with the interrelated movements from *praxis* to *theoria*, from letter to spirit, from flesh to glory, from partial to full vision.

In 2.18, a passage noted for its roots in Origen,[79] Maximus presents a summary of the spiritual *anabasis* to God. Taking as his starting point the Pauline phrases 'from strength to strength' and 'from glory to glory' (2 Corinthians 3:18), Maximus likens the necessity of lifting one's soul and mind in prayer from human to divine realities to the necessity of continual *progress* (προκοπή) in the practice of the virtues, *advancement* (ἐπανάβασις) in the spiritual knowledge of contemplation, and *transferral* (μετάβασις)[80] from the letter of scripture to the spirit. 'In this way,' he says,

> the mind will be able to follow the One who 'passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God' (Hebrews 4:14), who is everywhere and who has passed through (διεληλυθότι) all things in the economy on our behalf, so that following him, we also may pass through (διέλθωμεν) all things with him, and may come to be with him (πρὸς αὐτὸν),[81] if, that is, we perceive him not according to the limitations of his economic condescension, but according to the majestic splendour of his natural infinitude.[82]

---

[78] *Th.Oec.* 2.73-78.

[79] *De princ.* 2.11.6; see von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie*, 561.

[80] In connection with this passage or ascent of the soul/mind to God (see also *Th.Oec.* 2.77), Blowers (*Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 96-97) notes the prevalence of compounds of the verb -βαίνω (ἀνα-, δια-, μετα-, ἐπανα-). He advances the conjecture that Maximus uses these terms 'because they can convey for him both a sense of *transcendence*—in keeping with the need to "pass over," or to "ascend beyond," sensible objects and the passions which they can spark—and yet also the crucial sense of *continuity*, namely, the necessity of first "passing through" or "penetrating" sensible objects en route to the intelligible or spiritual truth that inheres, by grace, in those sensible things.'

[81] The use of the preposition πρός by the Fathers when speaking of location and movement with respect to God, often reflects its very deliberate use in John's gospel (e.g. John 1:1-2; 14:11) where it signifies the unique and close proximity of the Word/Son with God the Father, and human participation in that proximity.

[82] '. . . ἐάν γε νοῶμεν αὐτόν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν σμικρότητα τῆς οἰκονομικῆς συγκαταβάσεως, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν μεγαλειότητα τῆς φυσικῆς ἀοριστίας.'

The proximity indicated by the preposition πρός indicates a participation in the Son of God that brings the human subject, by grace, into that same relation with the Father enjoyed by the Son himself by nature. The intimacy is of a communal kind, ecclesial as well as binitarian. Having shown how in the descent and ascent of the Logos the whole destiny of man was typified,[83] Maximus speaks of humankind's final destiny with him before the Father, where 'God will be "in the assembly of the gods" that is, of those who are saved, standing in their midst and apportioning there the ranks of blessedness without any spatial distance separating him from the worthy.'[84]

It is the inherently trinitarian character of revelation,[85] and especially the revelation of the Son in the flesh, that shapes Maximus' understanding of the need to advance through the flesh of the incarnate Word to lay hold of the naked Word himself. For the whole Spirit and the whole Father are substantially united with the Word. The incarnation is a trinitarian event.[86] Repeatedly in the *Chapters on Theology* and elsewhere we come across the phrase 'the Word/the Son *of the Father*'.[87] The bodily manifestation of the Word-Son has as its ultimate object the revelation of the Father, who is 'by nature completely inseparable from the whole of his Word.'[88] In apprehending the Word, a person receives, or better, is received by the complete holy Trinity. It is not finally the vision of the glory of the Son to which the worthy attain, but the vision of the glory of the Father—in the Son—through the Spirit.[89]

This never detracts from Maximus' strongly christocentric and essentially incarnational vision. In fact, it strengthens it, for there can be no

---

[83] *Th.Oec.* 2.24.

[84] *Th.Oec.* 2.25.

[85] *Th.Oec.* 2.71. On the fundamentally trinitarian shape of revelation, see further Lars Thunberg, *Man and the Cosmos: The Vision of St Maximus the Confessor* (New York: Crestwood, 1985), 32; Felix Heinzer, 'L'Explication Trinitaire de L'Économie chez Maxime le Confesseur', in Heinzer and Schönborn, *Maximus Confessor. Actes du Symposium*, 161-162.

[86] See also *Q.Thal.* 60 (PG 90.624B-D); *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 31.87-97). The Father approves (εὐδοκῶν) the incarnation; the Son personally effects it (αὐτουργῶν); the Spirit co-operates in it (συνεργῶν). Compare Greg. Naz. *Or* 28.1.

[87] See, for example, *Th.Oec.* 2.21; 2.25; 2.71.

[88] *Th.Oec.* 2.71. Also *Th.Oec.* 2.22: 'Just as our human word which proceeds naturally from the mind is the messenger of the secret movements of the mind, so does the Word of God—who knows the Father by essence, as Word knows the Mind which has begotten it (since no created being can approach the Father without him)—reveal the Father whom he knows.'

[89] *Th.Oec.* 2.73.

vision of the Father except in the incarnate Son. But there are different levels of apprehension of the divine Word that appear to be conditioned by the corresponding level of knowledge of the inner meaning and salvific purpose of the incarnation. That is why, argues Maximus, the divine apostle Paul knew only 'in part', whereas the great evangelist John saw the glory of the only-begotten Son of the Father.[90] Paul's partial knowledge is the knowledge of the Word through his activities; John, it seems, pierces through the visible flesh of the Word and beholds the hidden yet revealed λόγος and σκοπός of the incarnation, that is, its specifically and inherently salvific (δι' ἡμᾶς) dimension, viewed from an eschatological perspective. This dimension has as its ultimate author and source not the Son, but the Father. It is the Father's glory which the only-begotten has made known. It is God's μεγαλὴ βουλή of which his Word is ὁ ἄγγελος.[91] In the overall fulfilment of that plan through the incarnation lies the accomplishment of our deifying adoption as sons of God.[92]

A parallel series of passages in which Maximus comments on the biblical phrases 'from strength to strength' and 'from glory to glory' occurs towards the end of the treatise. It is most significant that this treatment takes place within a trinitarian framework, and concludes with an explicit vision of what Maximus calls the μυστικὴ δοξολογία,[93] the eschatological culmination of the spiritual pilgrimage 'from strength to strength' and 'glory to glory'. The passage (μετάβασις), progress (προκοπή), and ascent (ἀνάβασις) to this blessed state of proximity to God the Father through the flesh of his Word is marked by ever increasing joy and thanksgiving. It is indeed paradoxical that in the face of such a *mysterium tremendum*, what is elsewhere imaged in terms of 'the formless, immaterial, and incorporeal state' of the darkness of the holy of holies,[94] is here presented in terms of the positive image of vocal, communal, jubilant doxology. To be sure, only when he has passed beyond the sensible and entered into the darkness of immediacy does Moses 'begin to adore God.'[95]

---

[90] *Th.Oec.* 2.76.

[91] *Th.Oec.* 2.22-23. The christological titles of Isaiah 9:6 are attributed to the ἄγγελος μεγάλης βουλῆς of Isaiah 9:5 (LXX). The μεγαλὴ βουλή of God is discussed at length in *Q.Thal.* 60 (*CCSG* 22, 73.5-75.48).

[92] *Th.Oec.* 2.21, 24-25.

[93] *Th.Oec.* 2.77-78.

[94] *Th.Oec.* 1.83-85.

[95] *Th.Oec.* 1.83-84. The passage bears apparent affinity with Gregory of Nyssa's commentary on Exodus 20:21: 'For leaving behind everything that is observed, not only

Despite the fact that the final *telos* of the worthy into the house of God is characterised by this state of adoration and rejoicing, there is nothing static about it. Indeed, Maximus is sensitive to the problems posed by the Origenist doctrine of 'satiety'. But his solution to the problem is subtle and profound. It is given in 2.88:

> Some seek to know what will be the state of those judged worthy of perfection in the kingdom of God, whether there will be progress and change or a settled state of sameness; and how one should think of bodies and souls. To this one might conjecture an answer by using the example of bodily life where there is a twofold reason for food: for both the growth and sustenance of those who are fed. For until we reach the perfection of bodily stature we are fed for growth; but when the body achieves the measure of its increase it is no longer fed for growth but for sustenance. In the same way there is a twofold reason for food for the soul. For while it is growing it is fed with virtues and contemplations until it no longer passes through all its stages and arrives at the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. At this point it leaves off making progress in increase and growth through various means and is fed directly (in a way which surpasses the mind and thus growth as well) a form of incorruptible food to sustain the Godlike perfection given to it and to manifest the infinite splendours of this food.

The passage from the need for growth to the need for sustenance parallels the passage from mediate to immediate knowledge of God.[96] In the words that follow, Maximus draws out the implications of the soul's immediate consumption of incorruptible food. Here we find present the main features of what we discovered at the beginning of this essay in the *locus classicus* from *Ambiguum* 10. In particular, there is the same reciprocal correspondence between divine revelation and human deification, with the attendant corporeal implications:

> When [the soul] receives through this food eternal blessedness indwelling in it, it becomes a god through the participation of divine grace, itself having left off all activities of mind and sense, and through itself having laid to rest

---

what sense comprehends but also what the intelligence thinks it sees, it keeps on penetrating deeper until by the intelligence's yearning for understanding it gains access to the invisible and the incomprehensible, and there it sees God. *This is the true knowledge of what is sought; this is the seeing that consists in not seeing, because that which is sought transcends all knowledge, being separated on all sides by incomprehensibility as by a kind of darkness.*' (*De vita Moysis* 2.163, emphasis added; trans. from Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson, *Gregory of Nyssa: The Life of Moses*, Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1978.)

[96] The Lord's Prayer teaches that the soul's true and heavenly food is the Bread of Life, the Word of God. *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 59.560-63.631). See also *Th.Oec.* 2.56.

> the natural activities of the body, which has been joined together with the soul in its own [ie., the body's] corresponding participation of deification. The result is that God alone is made manifest (φαίνεσθαι) through the soul *and the body*, their natural characteristics being overwhelmed by the transcendence of glory.[97]

Once again we find a paradox at work. Just as there can only be adoration and praise in the formless state of darkness and unknowing, so the body can only become a medium for divine manifestation when it has been transformed and transcended in the passage from sensible to intelligible means of apprehension. The φυσικὰ γνωρίσματα refer not to those marks that are proper to human nature by virtue of creation, but to the characteristic features of empirical life bordered by mortality and penetrated by corruption: sexual reproduction, passionate attachment, corruption, and death.[98] The body is not left out of participation with God and the deification of the soul. Rather, it is caught up and transfigured by the superabundant glory of the God in whom it participates in tandem with the soul.[99]

In the union of these distinct but integral elements—body and soul, sensible and intelligible—we have come full circle. For the same paradox is at work here that we have discerned in the mysterious unity, yet distinction between *apophasis* and *kataphasis*, between *theologia* and *economia*, between *theoria* and *praxis*, between spirit and letter, between Word and words. It is no surprise, then, that scholars have recognised in Maximus' theological system, to use Blowers' words, an 'instinct' toward unity in diversity. On that note, let me then defer to his more sublime description of a theme that has become apparent in this study in the *Chapters in Theology* in particular, and in Maximus' theology in general:

> [Maximus'] exegesis only manifests further his underlying vision of the healthy and thoroughly profitable diversity of material symbols in scripture and creation. The value of those symbols lies not in their sheer reducibility to one unifying spiritual logos in a timeless moment of contemplation. Maximus envisions the Logos-Christ, himself the final revealer of the comprehensive logos of all things, working precisely through the diversity of symbolic meanings in scripture and creation that are ever illuminating the practical, contemplative,

---

[97] *Th.Oec.* 2.88: '. . . νικηθέντων αὐτῶν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῆς δόξης, τῶν φυσικῶν γνωρισμάτων.'

[98] *Myst.* 24; *Or.Dom.* (*CCSG* 23, 50.401; 66.697).

[99] Maximus develops this further in a specifically christological context in *Amb.Io.* 42 (PG 91.1336A).

and mystagogical aspects of the monk's spiritual *diabasis*. Set in the context of Maximus' ongoing criticism of radical intellectualism in the Byzantine monastic tradition, authentic revelation is a process not of extreme spiritualization but of a *transfiguration* in which material realities disclose their created fullness κατὰ Χριστόν.[100]

University of Durham
Abbey House, Palace Green, *Durham* DH1 3RS, England

[100] Blowers, *Exegesis and Spiritual Pedagogy*, 254-255.

UN COMPLÉMENT DE L'ASCETICON COPTE DE L'ABBÉ ISAÏE

PAR

YOUHANNA NESSIM YOUSSEF

L'Abbé Isaïe est un moine égyptien; on lui attribue plusieurs œuvres spirituels.[1] La collection alphabétique des Apophtegmata Patrum Grecs ne citent que onze pièces tandis que la collection systematique inclue en tout 47 pièces attribuées à Isaïe de Scété.[2] M. Antoine Guillaumont a également édité ses paroles d'après les fragments des deux manuscrits Coptes[3] Sahidiques du Xe et du XIe siècles.[4] C'est avec raison que le Père Joseph-Marie Sauget, en éditant les fragments de l'Asceticon de l'Abbé Isaïe de Scété du Vatican arabe 71, a déclaré:

> Si en copte on n'a retrouvé jusqu'à présent que des fragments sahidiques provenant pour la plupart de deux manuscrits du Xe et XIe siècles et originaires du Deir-el-Abiad, il y a tout lieu de penser qu'également en cette langue circula une collection complète des œuvres de ce moine palestino-Egyptien.[5]

Afin de compléter le dossier de ce moine nous donnons ici bas un texte attribué à Isaïe l'anachorète, qui nous a été transmis par la chaîne Bohairique sur les Evangiles.[6] Ce texte explique le verset de Matthieu 5:25.

---

[1] Cf. L. Regnault, "Isaïe de Scété ou de Gaza," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 7, 1971, col. 2083-2095. R. Aubert, "Isaïe de Scété" *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclesiastique* Fasc. 150, Paris 1995, col. 120-124. Pour sa bibliographie cf. *CPG* 5555, 5556.

[2] Cf. J. C. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition Grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum*, (= *Subsidia Hagiographica* 36) ^{2}éd., Bruxelles 1984, p. 183-184.

[3] Pour une description détaillée des deux manuscrits cf. A. Guillaumont, "La recension Copte de l'Asceticon de l'Abbé Isaïe" *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*, The Byzantine Institute, Boston 1950, p. 49-60.

[4] A. Guillaumont, *L'Asceticon Copte de l'Abbé Isaïe, Bibliothèque d'Etudes Coptes* V, Le Caire 1956, p. ix.

[5] J.-M. Sauget, "Les fragments de l'Asceticon de l'abbé Isaïe de Scété du Vatican arabe 71" *Oriens Christianus* 48, 1964, p. 235-259 et en particulier p. 235.

[6] Pour une comparaison avec les chaînes Grecques cf. R. Devreesse, "Les chaînes exégétiques Grecques" *Dictionnaire de la Bible—Supplément*, éd. L. Pirot, Paris 1928, col. 1084-1233, et en particulier col. 1171, 1189, 1224 où Isaïe est mentionné.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Le manuscrit, daté de l'an 888 A.D., vient de la bibliothèque du Monastère el-Souriani de Wadi n'Natrûn mais qui était précédemment la propriété du Monastère de Saint Macaire.[7] Il est actuellement au *British Library Or. 8812*[8]

ⲏⲥⲁⲓⲁⲥ ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁⲭⲱⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲧⲉϥⲥⲩⲛⲏⲇⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲱⲱⲡⲓ ⲍⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲕⲕⲁϯ ⲛϫⲱⲗⲉⲙ ⲉⲛⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲥⲩⲛⲏⲇⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲍⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ ϩⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲕϫⲏ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲕϩⲱⲙⲓ ⲉⲍⲱⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲉⲥⲑⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲣⲱⲕϩ ⲛϭⲣϩⲓ ⲛϭⲏⲧⲕ ⲓⲧⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ ϩⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓϩⲁⲡ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲙⲏⲓ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲙⲡⲓϩⲩⲡⲉⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲱⲁⲧⲉⲕϯ ⲛϯϭⲁⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲃⲓ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲧϭⲁⲏ ⲙⲡⲓⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲧⲉ.

Isaïe l'anachorète, "L'accusateur *donc* de l'homme est sa *conscience*. Soit, *donc*, comprehesif vite avec ceux que ta *conscience* te dira, tant que tu es avec elle dans ce *monde afin que* tu ne la foules par l'*insensibilité* et qu'elle brule en toi. *Et puis après*, au jour du jugement, elle te livrera au main du vrai (juste) *juge*, et le juge te donnera au *serviteur*, Amen je te le dis; tu ne sortiras pas de là que tu n'aies rendu jusqu'au dernier sou[9] qui est la fin de l'Eternité."[10]

Notre texte est plus développé que le texte correspond en Grec ou en Syriaque du Logos 11/99.[11]

Il est curieux que notre texte utilise pour "conscience" ⲥⲩⲛⲏⲇⲓⲥⲓⲥ, à deux reprises, or le professeur Draguet s'était prononcé pour une origine Copte du texte avec le terme ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ.[12] La traduction arabe de la chaîne sur l'évangile de Matthieu utilise le mot مزخسر = "Sens", ce qui ne peut pas représenter le terme suggéré par le professeur Draguet.[13]

Le vocabulaire Copto-Grec qui se trouve également dans la recension grecque est pour la plupart présent dans le texte biblique, à savoir: ⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛⲉⲥⲑⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ϩⲏⲡⲉⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ. D'autre part,

---

[7] Pour la bibliothèque de Saint Macaire cf H. Evelyn White, *The Monasteries of the Wadi'n Natrun* Part I, New York 1926, p. xxiii-xlii, L. Störk, *Koptische Handschriften* 2, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XX/2, Stuttgart 1995, p. 52-98.

[8] B. Layton, *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the year 1906*, The British Library, London 1987, N°249, p. 389-394.

[9] Matthieu 5:26.

[10] P. de Lagarde, *Catenae in Evangelia Aegyptiaca quae supersunt*, Gottingae 1886, ²édition Osnabrück 1971, p. 10:9-16.

[11] R. Draguet, *Les cinq recensions de l'Ascéticon Syriaque d'Abba Isaïe, CSCO* 293, *Syri* 122, Louvain 1968, p. 195-196.

[12] Draguet, op.cit., p. 46*-47*.

[13] cf. F. J. Caubet Iturbe, *La Cadena Arabe del Evangelio de San Mateo* (= *Studi e Testi* 254) Città del Vaticano 1969, p. 50-51. Id., *La Cadena Arabe del Evangelio de San Mateo* (= *Studi e Testi* 255) Città del Vaticano 1970, p. 58 note 2,3.

nous rencontrons d'autres termes qui n'ont pas de parallèle à savoir: ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲓⲧⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ.

Le professeur R. Draguet avait donc raison en ce qui concerne le texte biblique car notre texte est très proche du Nouveau Testament Copte, mais dans ce cas précis la version Bohairique[14] est plus proche du texte d'Isaïe que la version Sahidique,[15] comme le montre le tableau suivant:

Isaïe de Scété[16]	Matthieu Bohairique	Matthieu Sahidique
ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲉϥⲥⲩⲛⲏⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲯⲱⲡⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲕⲕⲁϯ ⲛⲭⲱⲗⲉⲙ ⲉⲛⲏⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲥⲩⲛⲏⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲍⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ	ⲯⲱⲡⲓ ⲉⲕⲕⲁϯ ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲛⲭⲱⲗⲉⲙ ⲫⲱⲥ ⲉϥⲭⲏ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲕ ⲫⲓ ⲡⲓⲙⲱⲓⲧ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ	ⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲥⲉ ⲉⲕⲟⲩⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲁⲓⲣⲁⲛ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲕ ⲣⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲥⲉⲡⲏ ⲉⲛⲫⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲕⲯⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲫⲓ ⲧⲉϥⲣⲏ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ
ⲫⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲕⲭⲏ ⲋⲉⲛ ⲡⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲥ ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲕⲫⲱⲙⲓ ⲉⲍⲱⲥ ⲫⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲁ-ⲛⲉⲥ ⲑⲏⲧⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲣ-ⲱⲕⲫ ⲛⲋⲣⲏⲓ ⲛⲋⲏⲧⲕ ⲓⲧⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲗⲟⲓⲡⲟⲛ ⲋⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲉⲫ-ⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲫⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲥ-ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲙⲏⲓ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓ-ⲧⲏⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲙⲡⲓⲫⲩⲡⲉⲣⲉ-ⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲁⲧⲉⲕϯ ⲛϯⲋⲁⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲃⲓ	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲧⲓⲁⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲓⲥ ⲧⲏⲓⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲩⲡⲏⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲫ ⲛⲥⲉⲫⲓⲧⲕ ⲉⲡⲓⲯⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲁⲧⲉⲕϯ ⲛϯⲋⲁⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲃⲓ	ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲓⲣⲁⲛ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲕ ⲧⲁⲁⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲣⲉϥ-ϯⲫⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲣⲉϥϯⲫⲁⲛ ⲧⲁⲁⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲫⲩⲡⲏ-ⲣⲉⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲥⲉⲛⲟⲍⲕ ⲉⲡⲉ-ⲯⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲫⲁⲙⲏⲛ ϯⲍⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲫⲙ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲁⲛⲧⲕϯ ⲙⲡⲫⲁⲉ ⲛⲕⲟⲁ-ⲣⲁⲛⲧⲩⲥ

[14] G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Vol. I, Oxford 1898 ²édition, Osnabrück 1969, p. 30.

[15] G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect*, Vol. I, Oxford 1911 ²édition, Osnabrück 1969, p. 36.

[16] Les mots soulignés sont communs dans les autres versions.

De ce que nous avons exposé, nous pouvons conclure que le texte inserré dans la chaîne exégetique Copte peut bien être attribué à Isaïe de Scété. Il est vraisemblable qu'une collection Copte Bohaïrique de l'Asceticon d'Isaïe existait en plus de ce qui est connue de la version Sahidique.[17]

Cette note confirme en partie les thèses des regrettés professeurs J.-M. Sauget et R. Draguet.

P.O. Box 91
East Doncaster
VIC 3109
AUSTRALIA

[17] Ce qui est logiquement plausible puisque Isaïe est par définition un habitant de la Basse-Egypte (Scété).

DIE KIRCHENVÄTER IN OECUMENIUS' *SCHOLIA IN IOHANNEM CHRYSOSTOMUM*

VON

MARC DE GROOTE

Seit der Edition seiner *Scholia in Iohannem Chrysostomum* (CPG 7472)[1] und der kürzlich erschienenen Ausgabe seines *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (CPG 7470)[2] sind hinfort die beiden authentischen Werke des Oecumenius (6. Jh.) dem Leser vollständig zugänglich. Die Lektüre beider Schriften weist eine frappante Kenntnis des Autors von der Literatur der Kirchenväter auf: Manchmal zitiert er aus ihrem Œuvre oder spielt darauf an.[3] Der Wichtigkeit solcher Zitate und Anspielungen halber, die seit K. Staab außer allem Zweifel steht,[4] liste ich in der untenstehenden Tabelle alphabetisch geordnet alle Kirchenväter auf, die von Oecumenius in seinen Scholien zu Johannes Chrysostomus benutzt wurden.

---

[1] K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*, Münster 1933, S. XXXVII-XL und 423-469. In diesem Werk wurde (S. XXXVII-XXXVIII) überzeugend nachgewiesen, dass Oecumenius, der seit Donatus' Edition einer Katene zu den paulinischen Briefen (CPG C 165) aus dem Jahre 1532 jahrhundertelang zu den größten Paulus-Exegeten gezählt wurde, in Wirklichkeit nur der Autor einiger erklärenden Noten gewesen ist, die nicht zu den paulinischen Briefen an sich gehören, sondern von ihm als Glossen einem Paulus-Kommentar, den er gerade kopierte, hinzugefügt wurden, nämlich den Homilien des Johannes Chrysostomus über die paulinischen Briefen (CPG 4427-4440).

[2] M. De Groote, *Oecumenii Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, Traditio Exegetica Graeca 8, Lovanii 1999.

[3] Cf. K. Staab, *o.c.*, S. XXXIX; M. De Groote, *o.c.*, S. 326-336; id., Die Quaestio Oecumeniana, *SEJG* 36 (1996), S. 104.

[4] K. Staab, *l.c.*: Solche Zitate sind uns wertvoller als seine eigene Paulusexegese.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

1. Athanasius Alex.

In I Cor. 6,15-18

Καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου ἔστι πρὸς τούτοις ἅπασιν ἑρμηνεία ἐν τῷ Περὶ σεμνοῦ γάμου (435,9-10: "Neben all diesem gibt es auch von dem heiligen Athanasius eine Erklärung in seinem Werk *De venerandis nuptiis*")
Vielleicht Hinweis auf eine Homilie, die uns nicht mehr erhalten ist.[5]

2. Basilius Caesar.

In II Thess. 3,5

Ὁ μακάριος Βασίλειος ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Ἀμφιλόχιον τοῦτο σημειοῦται, ὅτι τῷ πνεύματι εὔχεται ὁ Παῦλος (458,10-11: "Der selige Basilius notiert dies in seiner Schrift *Ad Amphilochium*, weil Paulus zu dem Geist betet")
= *De spiritu sancto* (CPG 2839) XXI (§ 52): Εὕρομεν τοίνυν παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ· "Ὁ δὲ Κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν θλίψεων." Τίς ὁ κατευθύνων Κύριος εἰς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπην καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπομονήν; Ἀποκρινάσθωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα καταδουλούμενοι. Εἴτε γὰρ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὁ λόγος, πάντως ἂν εἴρητο· Ὁ δὲ Κύριος ὑμᾶς κατευθύναι εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην· εἴτε περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, προσέκειτο ἂν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὑπομονήν. Ζητείτωσαν οὖν τί ἐστιν ἄλλο πρόσωπον, ὃ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου τιμᾶσθαι ἄξιον.[6]

In I Tim. 5,24-25

Ὁ δέ γε μακάριος Βασίλειος οὕτως ἡρμήνευσεν, ὡς οὐδὲν τοῦ κεφαλαίου πρὸς χειροτονίαν συντείνοντος (459,21-22: "Der selige Basilius hat es so ausgelegt, dass nichts in diesem Kapitel in die Richtung einer Auserwählung weist")
Locus non repertus.

---

[5] So id., *o.c.*, S. 435 app. crit. 9/10.

[6] Ed. B. Pruche, *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit.* Introduction, texte, traduction et notes. Deuxième édition entièrement refondue, SChr 17bis, Paris 1968, S. 432,10-20: "Wir fanden also bei dem Apostel: 'Der Herr richte euer Herz zur Liebe Gottes und zur Beharrlichkeit Christi in den Prüfungen'. Wer ist dieser Herr, der zur Liebe Gottes und zur Beharrlichkeit Christi in den Prüfungen richtet? Dass diejenigen uns Antwort geben, die den Geist versklaven! Wenn der Satz von Gott dem Vater handelte, hätte er unbedingt gesagt: 'Der Herr richte euch zu *seiner* Liebe'; wenn er aber den Sohn gemeint hätte, wäre daran 'zu *seiner* Beharrlichkeit' hinzugefügt worden. Dass sie also suchen, wer diese andere Person ist, die es würdig ist, mit dem Namen 'Herr' geehrt zu werden."

3. Clemens Alex.

In II Tim. 2,2

οὕτως ὁ Κλήμης ἐν ἑβδόμῳ Ὑποτυπώσεων (460,24-26: "So Clemens im 7. Buch der *Hypotyposes*")
= *Hypotyposes* VII (CPG 1380): "Διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων" τουτέστι νόμου καὶ προφητῶν. τούτους γὰρ <ὁ> ἀπόστολος ἐποιεῖτο μάρτυρας τοῦ ἰδίου κηρύγματος. Οὕτως ὁ Κλήμης ἐν ἑβδόμῳ Ὑποτυπώσεων.[7]

4. Cyrillus Alex.

In Rom. 9,29

Δύνῃ δὲ καὶ περὶ Χριστοῦ νοῆσαι τοῦτο· οὕτως ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Κύριλλος (429,24-25: "Man kann dies auch auf Christus beziehen; so der heilige Cyrillus")
a) = *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam* (CPG 5203) I,1: Οὐ γὰρ ἀπόλωλεν ὁλοτρόπως (sc. ὁ Ἰσραήλ) (. . .). Ἦσαν γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ θεσπέσιοι μαθηταί, καὶ μὴν καὶ ὅσοι πεπιστεύκασιν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν.[8]
b) = *Fragmenta in S. Pauli epistulas: Fragmenta in epist. ad Romanos* (CPG 5209 (1)). Nicht mehr erhalten.[9]

In Eph. 2,2

Ὥστε κατὰ τὸ νόημα τοῦτο, ὃ μᾶλλον καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Κύριλλος (. . .) δέχεται, . . . (448,15-16: "Folglich dieser Ansicht entsprechend, die vielmehr auch der heilige Cyrillus annimmt, . . .")
= *Fragmenta in S. Pauli epistulas: Fragmenta in epist. in Ephesios.*
Nicht mehr erhalten.[10]

---

[7] Ed. O. Stählin – L. Früchtel – U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus* III. *Stromata Buch VII und VIII. Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae propheticae, Quis diues saluetur, Fragmente*, GCS 17², Berlin 1970, S. 201,13-15 (= Fragment 21), übernommen aus der Edition des F. Morellus, II., Paris 1631, S. 263: "'Vor vielen Zeugen', d.h. Gesetz und Propheten; diese betrachtete der Apostel nämlich als Zeugen seiner eigenen Verkündigung. So Clemens im 7. Buch der *Hypotyposes*." Cf. Theophylactus von Bulgarien, *Expositio in Epistulam II ad Timotheum* II,2: Τινὲς δέ, *πολλοὺς μάρτυρας*, νόμον καὶ προφήτας ἐνόησαν. Γραφικαῖς γὰρ μαρτυρίαις συνεκροτεῖτό μοι ὁ λόγος (ed. PG 125,101B11-13).—Cf. Anm. 13.

[8] Ed. PG 70,29A7-11: "Denn Israel ist nicht ganz zugrunde gegangen. (. . .) Daraus sind doch auch die heiligen Jünger hervorgegangen und auch all diejenigen, die an unseren Herrn Jesus Christus geglaubt haben." Betrifft eine Erklärung von *Is.* 1,9. Für die Exegese von *Rom.* 9,29, siehe Anm. 9.

[9] Cf. K. Staab, *o.c.*, S. 429 app. crit. 25.

[10] Cf. id., *o.c.*, S. 448 app. crit. 15/16.

In Hebr. 12,27

a) Πρόσχες καὶ τῇ παραγραφῇ τοῦ μακαρίου Κυρίλλου εἰς τὸν Ἀγγαῖον (469,2-3: "Man achte auch auf die Anmerkung des seligen Cyrillus mit Bezug auf Aggaeus")
= *Commentarius in XII prophetas minores* (CPG 5204), 13 betreffs *Agg.* 2,6: τοιοῦτόν τινα σεισμὸν πάλιν ἔσεσθαί φησι κατὰ τὸν τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιδημίας καιρόν, ὡς οὐδενὸς ἀγνοήσειν μέλλοντος τὰ δι' αὐτῆς κατορθώματα. ἔγνω μὲν γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς τὸ μυστήριον, καὶ τούτου μάρτυς ὁ Παῦλος λέγων "..." [*Eph.* 3,10].[11]
b) οὕτως ὁ Κύριλλος (468,21: "So Cyrillus")
= *Fragmenta in S. Pauli epistulas: Fragmenta in epist. ad Hebraeos* (CPG 5209 (3)): Ἔγνω μὲν γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς τὸ μυστήριον, ἔγνω δὲ ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ σύμπασα γῆ· δύο γὰρ γεγόνασι μεταθέσεις βίων ἐπιφανεῖς ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος, καὶ διαθῆκαι δύο καλοῦνται, καὶ σεισμοὶ γῆς, διὰ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος περιβόητον· ἡ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων ἐπὶ τὸν νόμον, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου πρὸς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· καὶ τρίτον σεισμὸν εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε μετάστασιν, τὰ μηκέτι κινούμενα μηδὲ σαλευόμενα.[12]

5. Eusebius Caesar.

In Gal. 2,11-16

Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἱστορίᾳ ἀποδείκνυσι μὴ εἶναι τὸν Κηφᾶν τοῦτον τὸν Πέτρον, ἀλλ' ὁμώνυμον αὐτῷ ἕνα τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα (446,9-11: "Eusebius, Schüler des Pamphilus, zeigt in seiner *Historia ecclesiastica*, dass dieser Cephas nicht Petrus ist, sondern ein Gleichnamiger, einer der siebzig")
= *Historia ecclesiastica* (CPG 3495) I,12,2: (...) καὶ Κηφᾶν, περὶ οὗ φησιν ὁ

---

[11] Ed. P.E. Pusey, *Sancti Patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII prophetas* II. Oxonii 1868, Bruxelles 1965², S. 265,7-11: "Er sagt, dass es um die Zeit des Erscheinens des Heilands wieder solch ein Beben geben wird, weil keiner nicht das Gute kennen wird, das dadurch kommen wird. Der Himmel kannte doch das Mysterium, und davon ist Paulus ein Zeuge, wenn er sagt: ..."

[12] Ed. id., *Sancti Patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Ioannis evangelium* III. Oxonii 1872, Bruxelles 1965², S. 415,12-19: "Der Himmel sowie die ganze Erde kannten doch das Mysterium. Im Laufe der Zeit haben nämlich zwei außergewöhnliche Änderungen im Leben stattgefunden—sie werden 'die zwei Testamente' genannt und 'Erdbeben' wegen der Bekanntheit eines solchen Ereignisses—: die erste Änderung von den Götzenbildern zum Gesetz, die zweite vom Gesetz zum Evangelium. Jetzt wird uns ein drittes Beben angekündigt, nämlich der Umzug aus dem Leben hier zu dem, was jenseits ist, und nicht mehr in Aufruhr gebracht oder erschüttert werden wird."

Παῦλος "ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην", (*Gal.* 2,11) ἕνα φησὶ (sc. Clemens Alex., *Hypotyposes* V) γεγονέναι τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν, ὁμώνυμον Πέτρῳ τυγχάνοντα τῷ ἀποστόλῳ.[13]

6. Gregorius Naz.

In I Cor. 2,16

νοῦν γὰρ τὸν πατέρα λέγειν ἔθος τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὡς Γρηγόριος (432,25-433,1: "Die Heiligen pflegen den Vater Noûς zu nennen, wie Gregorius"); es folgen zwei Zitate (433,1-2 und 2-4).
= (1) *Orationes* (CPG 3010) XII,1: ἀλλὰ καὶ κλείω καὶ ἀνοίγω τὴν ἐμὴν θύραν Νῷ καὶ Λόγῳ καὶ Πνεύματι, τῇ μιᾷ συμφυίᾳ τε καὶ θεότητι.[14]
= (2) *Orationes* XXXVIII,9 = XLV,5: πρῶτον μὲν ἐννοεῖ (sc. ἡ ἀγαθότης) τὰς ἀγγελικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ οὐρανίους· καὶ τὸ ἐννόημα ἔργον ἦν, Λόγῳ συμπληρούμενον καὶ Πνεύματι τελειούμενον.[15]

In Eph. 1,17

Ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Γρηγόριος ἐν τῷ Περὶ υἱοῦ λόγῳ, ὡς νομίζω, τὰ δύο εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν ἐδέξατο (448,5-6: "Meiner Meinung nach bezog der heilige Gregorius in seiner Rede *De Filio* beide (sc. *Θεός* und *πατήρ*) auf Christus")
= *Orationes* XXX (theologica IV),8: Χριστοῦ μὲν Θεός, τῆς δὲ δόξης Πατήρ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ συναμφότερον ἕν, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ φύσει, τῇ δὲ συνόδῳ τούτων.[16]

---

[13] Ed. E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke* II. *Die Kirchengeschichte.*—Th. Mommsen, *Die lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus.* Erster Teil. *Die Bücher I bis V*, GCS 9,1, Leipzig 1903, S. 82,2-5: "... und er behauptet, dass Cephas, über den Paulus sagt: 'Als Cephas aber nach Antiochien gekommen war, bin ich ihm offen entgegengetreten,' einer der siebzig Schüler gewesen ist, Namensbruder des Apostels Petrus." Cf. O. Stählin – L. Früchtel – U. Treu, *o.c.*, S. 196,10-13 (= Fragment 4).

[14] Ed. M.-A. Calvet-Sebasti, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 6-12.* Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, SChr 405, Paris 1995, S. 350,1-3: "Aber ich schließe und öffne meine Tür für den Noûς, das Wort und den Geist, für die einzige Einheit und Göttlichkeit."

[15] *Or.* XXXVIII,9 ed. C. Moreschini, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41.* Introduction, texte critique et notes. Traduction par P. Gallay, SChr 358, Paris 1990, S. 120,6-8; *Or.* XLV,5 ed. PG 36,629A7-10: "Zuerst denkt sie (sc. ἡ ἀγαθότης) an die Mächte der Engel und die himmlischen Mächte, und dieses Denken war ein Werk, das von dem Wort vollbracht und von dem Geist vollendet wird."

[16] Ed. P. Gallay, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques).* Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Avec la collaboration de M. Jourjon, SChr 250, Paris 1978, S. 242,6-7: "Er ist der Gott Christi und der Vater der Herrlichkeit. Beide sind zwar eins, aber nicht von Natur aus, sondern durch ihre Union."

In Hebr. 10,1

a) εἴρηται τῷ ἐν ἁγίοις Γρηγορίῳ ἐν τῷ Ἀπολογητικῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πρὸς τοὺς πολιτευομένους, τὰ νῦν θεῖα μυστήρια ἀντίτυπα εἶναι μειζόνων μυστηρίων (466,16-18: "Der heilige Gregorius hat in seiner *Apologetica* und in der Rede *Ad cives* (sc. *Nazianzenos*) gesagt, dass die göttlichen Mysterien, von denen jetzt die Rede ist, Kopien größerer Mysterien sind")
= (1) *Orationes* (CPG 3010) II,95: πῶς ἔμελλον θαρρῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν ἔξωθεν (sc. θυσίαν), τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον;[17]
= (2) *Orationes* XVII,4: Καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι δόγμα Θεοῦ παλαιόν τε καὶ πάγιον, σκότος εἶναι ἀποκρυφὴν αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὀφθαλμῶν κεχυμένον· καὶ τὰ πολλὰ μὴ καθορᾶσθαι τῆς αὐτοῦ διοικήσεως, πλὴν ὅσον ἐν ἀμυδροῖς αἰνίγμασι καὶ φαντάσμασιν· εἴτε τὸν τῦφον ἡμῶν συστέλλοντος, ἵν' εἰδῶμεν τὸ μηδὲν ὄντες πρὸς τὴν ἀληθινὴν σοφίαν καὶ πρώτην, ἀλλὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν νεύωμεν μόνον, καὶ ζητῶμεν ἀεὶ ταῖς ἐκεῖθεν αὐγαῖς ἐναστράπτεσθαι· εἴτε διὰ τῆς ἀνωμαλίας τῶν ὁρωμένων καὶ περιτρεπομένων μετάγοντος ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰ ἑστῶτα καὶ μένοντα.[18]
b) καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἀναστάσεως (466,18: "Und wiederum in seiner Rede *De resurrectione*"); es folgt ein Zitat (466,19-20).
= *Orationes* XLV,23: Μεταληψόμεθα δὲ τοῦ Πάσχα, νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, καὶ εἰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον (τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν Πάσχα, τολμῶ καὶ λέγω, τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυδρότερος) μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον, τελεώτερον καὶ καθαρώτερον.[19]

In Hebr. 12,2

. . . ὡς καὶ Γρηγόριός φησιν (467,20: "wie auch Gregorius sagt"); es folgt ein Zitat (467,20-468,3).
= *Orationes* XII,4: Ἐπεὶ καὶ Χριστὸς οὕτως, ᾧ μένειν ἐξὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας τιμῆς καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν μέχρι τῆς τοῦ δούλου μορφῆς [cf. *Phil.*

---

[17] Ed. J. Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 1-3*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, SChr 247, Paris 1978, S. 212,21-214,1: "Wie würde ich es wagen, ihm das externe Opfer anzubieten, die Kopie der großen Mysterien?"

[18] Ed. PG 35,969C3-13: "Und dies ist ein altes und festgegründetes Dekret Gottes, dass er sich in der vor unseren Augen ausgegossenen Finsternis versteckt, und dass das meiste seiner Herrschaft nicht durchschaut werden kann, außer in obskuren Rätseln und Visionen. Entweder will er unsere Eitelkeit zügeln, damit wir wissen, dass wir gegenüber der wahren und ersten Weisheit nichts bedeuten, und darum nur zu ihm neigen und stets suchen, von den dorther flutenden Strahlen erleuchtet zu werden, oder uns durch die Unbeständigkeit desjenigen, was erkennbar und dem Wandel unterworfen ist, zu demjenigen führen, was fest und bleibend ist."

[19] Ed. PG 36,653C10-656A4: "Wir werden des Osterfestes teilhaftig sein, jetzt noch symbolisch, obwohl offener als im alten Gesetz (das gesetzliche Osterfest war—ich scheue es nicht, das zu sagen—eine obskure Ansicht schlechthin), aber ein wenig später vollständiger und purer."

2,6-7], ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ἵν' ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πάθεσιν ἀναλώσῃ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καὶ ἀποκτείνῃ τῷ θανάτῳ τὸν θάνατον.[20]

7. Gregorius Nyss.

In Rom. 5,13-14a

. . . ὧν καὶ Γρηγόριος ὑπάρχει ἐν τῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ποιήματι (424,25-26: ". . . zu denen auch Gregorius mit seinem Werk *De opificio hominis* gehört")
= *De opificio hominis* (CPG 3154) XXI: νυνὶ δὲ σύμμικτός πως ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ κακοῦ φύσις, ἐν μὲν τῷ βάθει τὸν ὄλεθρον οἷόν τινα δόλον ἐγκεκρυμμένον ἔχουσα, ἐν δὲ τῇ κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἀπάτῃ καλοῦ τινα φαντασίαν παραδεικνύουσα. καλὸν δοκεῖ τοῖς φιλαργύροις ἡ τῆς ὕλης εὐχροια· ἀλλὰ ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἡ φιλαργυρία γίνεται. τίς δ' ἂν ἐπὶ τὸν δυσώδη βόρβορον τῆς ἀκολασίας κατώλισθεν, εἰ μὴ τὴν ἡδονὴν καλόν τε καὶ αἱρετὸν ᾤετο ὁ τῷ δελέατι τούτῳ πρὸς τὸ πάθος κατασυρόμενος; οὕτω καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐγκεκρυμμένην ἔχοντα τὴν διαφθοράν, αἱρετὰ παρὰ τὴν πρώτην δοκεῖ, διά τινος ἀπάτης τοῖς ἀνεπισκέπτοις ἀντ' ἀγαθοῦ σπουδαζόμενα.[21]

In Eph. 3,10

Οὕτως ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Γρηγόριος ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ὁμιλίᾳ τῆς ἑρμηνείας τῶν Ἀσμάτων διασαφηνίζων λέγει (449,14-16: "So erklärt der heilige Gregorius in der 8. seiner *In Canticum canticorum homiliae*")
= *In Canticum canticorum homiliae* (CPG 3158) VIII.[22]

---

[20] Ed. M.-A. Calvet-Sebasti, *o.c.*, S. 356,9-14: "Denn es ist so, dass Christus, obgleich es ihm möglich war, in seiner eigenen Würdigkeit und Göttlichkeit zu bleiben, sich nicht nur entäußerte und wie ein Sklave wurde, sondern auch unter Missbilligung der Schande das Kreuz ertrug, damit er in seinen eigenen Peinen die Sünden vernichtete und den Tod durch seinen Tod sterben ließ."

[21] Ed. G.H. Forbes, *Sancti Patris nostri Gregorii Nysseni, Basilii M. fratris, quae supersunt omnia* I., Burntisland 1855, S. 226,19-30: "Jetzt aber ist die Natur des Bösen irgendwie divers: Grundsätzlich trägt sie in sich den Untergang wie eine versteckte List, indes sie dem äußeren Schein nach betrügerisch das Gute sehen lässt. Für denjenigen, der auf Geld erpicht ist, scheint die schöne Farbe des Materials etwas Hervorragendes; Habgier ist dennoch die Wurzel allen Übels. Wer versänke im stinkenden Schlamm der Zügellosigkeit, wenn er nicht, durch ein solches Lockmittel in diese Krankheit gezogen, meinte, der Genuss wäre eine gute, wünschenswerte Sache? So auch scheinen die übrigen Sünden, die in sich verschollen den Untergang tragen, zuerst wünschenswert, und streben die Unachtsamen irregeleitet statt nach dem Guten ihnen nach."

[22] Cf. H. Langerbeck, *Gregorii Nysseni in Canticum canticorum*, in: Gregorii Nysseni opera auxilio aliorum virorum doctorum edenda curavit W. Jaeger VI., Leiden 1960, S. 254,13-256,5.

8. Johannes Chrysostomus

In I Cor. 6,15-18

. . . ταύτην τε αὐτὴν εἰπὼν τῇ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννου (434,14-15: ". . . und sagt, dass es sich um dieselbe Interpretation handelt wie die des heiligen Johannes") = *In epistulam I ad Corinthios homiliae* (CPG 4429) XVIII,1.[23]

In I Cor. 7,25-28

Τὰ *περὶ παρθένων* ἐμμελέστερον ἡρμήνευσεν ὡς ἐν μονοβίβλῳ τὰ περὶ τούτου διαλαβών (436,16-17: "Die Darlegungen bezüglich der Jungfrauen erklärte er eingehender in einer besonderen Schrift über dieses Thema") = *De virginitate* (CPG 4313) (436,16-17).[24]

In Eph. 2,2

Ὥστε κατὰ τὸ νόημα τοῦτο, ὃ μᾶλλον (. . .) καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης δέχεται, . . . (448,15-16: "Folglich dieser Ansicht entsprechend, die vielmehr auch der heilige Johannes annimmt, . . .")
= *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae* (CPG 4431) IV,1: Ὁρᾷς τὸ προσηνὲς τοῦ Παύλου, καὶ πῶς πανταχοῦ παραμυθεῖται τὸν ἀκροατήν, οὐ βαρῶν αὐτόν; Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἶπεν, ὅτι εἰς ἔσχατον κακίας ἠλάσατε· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι νεκρωθῆναι· ὥστε μὴ σφόδρα βαρῦναι αὐτούς· αἰσχύνονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῶν προτέρων κακῶν εἰς μέσον φερομένων, κἂν ἀπολλύμενα ᾖ καὶ κίνδυνον οὐκ ἔχοντα· δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς συνεργόν, ὥστε μὴ νομισθῆναι τὸ πᾶν αὐτῶν εἶναι, καὶ συνεργὸν ἰσχυρόν. Τίνα δὴ τοῦτον; Τὸν διάβολον.[25]

---

[23] Ed. F. Field, *Sancti Patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani interpretatio omnium epistolarum Paulinarum per homilias facta* II., Oxford 1847, S. 205,15-207,16.

[24] Ed. H. Musurillo, *Jean Chrysostome. La virginité.* Texte et introduction critiques. Introduction générale, traduction et notes par B. Grillet, SChr 125, Paris 1966, S. 92-394.

[25] Ed. F. Field, *o.c.* IV., Oxford 1852, S. 136,23-30: "Siehst du die Sanftmütigkeit des Paulus und wie er überall den Zuhörer tröstet, ohne ihn zu belasten? Er hat gesagt: 'Ihr seid bis zur äußersten Bosheit gegangen' (das ist mit dem Sterben gemeint); damit er sie nicht schwer belastet—denn die Menschen schämen sich, wenn ihre früheren Schlechtigkeiten vorgebracht werden, selbst wenn sie vergeben sind und keine Gefahr darstellen—, gibt er ihnen einen Helfer, damit sie nicht meinen, dass alles ihnen angerechnet wird, und zwar einen starken. Wer ist denn dieser? Der Teufel."

In Eph. 4,16

. . . οὔτε γὰρ ἐχώρησα τὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰω<άννου> ἔξει νοῆσαι (450,5-6: "denn ich konnte die Ausführungen des seligen Johannes nicht genau verstehen") = *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae* XI,3.[26]

In Eph. 6,17

τμητικὸν γὰρ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ. οὕτω μᾶλλον ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης (452,6-7: "Denn das Wort Gottes kann schneiden; so vielmehr der selige Johannes") = *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae* XXIV,1: Ἤτοι τὸ πνεῦμά φησιν, ἤτοι ἐν τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τῇ πνευματικῇ. Διὰ γὰρ ταύτης πάντα τέμνεται, διὰ ταύτης πάντα διακόπτεται, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δράκοντος ἀποτέμνομεν διὰ ταύτης.[27]

In Col. (Epilogus)

. . . τὰς παραγραφὰς τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου τῆς πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς ἐπιστολῆς (455,23-24: ". . . die Erklärungen des seligen Johannes zum Kolosserbrief") = *In epistulam ad Colossenses homiliae* (CPG 4433) I-XII.[28]

9. Severianus Gabalensis

In I Cor. 6,15-18

Εἶπεν εἰς τοῦτο πλείους ἑρμηνείας ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Σευηριανὸς τεύχει νζ΄ λόγῳ ς΄ κεφαλαίῳ ιθ΄ (434,13-14: "Der heilige Severianus hat hierzu in seinem 57. Buch, 6. Rede, 19. Kapitel mehrere Erklärungen gegeben") = *Fragmenta in epistulas S. Pauli* (CPG 4219) LVII,6,19 (434,13-14).[29]

Schließlich soll auch auf die Eigentümlichkeit hingewiesen werden, dass Oecumenius in diesen Scholien zweimal auf eigenes Werk verweist: Mit Bezug auf *Hebr.* 9,1-4 schreibt er: Τρεῖς ἐσημειωσάμην εἰς τὸ Ὀκτάτευχον σκηνὰς οὔσας· μίαν μέν, περὶ ἧς φησιν τὸ *ἅγιον κοσμικόν* [*Hebr.* 9,1], ἔνθα ἦν

---

[26] Ed. id., *o.c.* IV., Oxford 1852, S. 220,11-221,3.

[27] Ed. id., *o.c.* IV., Oxford 1852, S. 353,18-21: "Entweder sagt er 'der Geist' oder 'im geistlichen Schwert'. Denn durch dieses Schwert wird alles geschnitten, dadurch wird alles durchfurcht, dadurch schneiden wir dem Drachen den Kopf ab."

[28] Ed. id., *o.c.* V., Oxford 1855, S. 172-312.

[29] K. Staab, *o.c.*, S. 434,13-17 (*Oec.*): cf. S. 248,6-11 (*Sev. in I Cor.* 6,16-19) || S. 434,17-24 (*Oec.*): cf. S. 248,11-30 (*Sev. in I Cor.* 6,16-19).

τὸ χαλκοῦν θυσιαστήριον τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων, καὶ παντὶ ἐξῆν τῷ λαῷ εἰσιέναι καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖν· δευτέραν δὲ ἔνθα τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἐξῆν ἀεὶ τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελεῖν [cf. *Hebr.* 9,6], ἔνθα ἦν *ἡ λυχνία καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων* [*Hebr.* 9,2]. τρίτην ἔνθα ἦν τὸ θυμιατήριον καὶ ἡ κιβωτός [cf. *Hebr.* 9,4] ἐν ᾗ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ εἰσῄει μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς [cf. *Hebr.* 9,7] (465,7-13: "Ich habe niedergeschrieben, dass es, was den Oktateuch betrifft, drei Zelte gibt: eines, über das er sagt: *ein irdisches Heiligtum*, in dem sich der bronzene Altar für die Brandopfer befand—das ganze Volk konnte hineintreten und die Opfer bringen—, ein zweites in dem die Priester die heiligen Dienste verrichten konnten—dort waren *der Leuchter, der Tisch und die Schaubrote*—, ein drittes in dem sich das Weinrauchfass und die Lade befanden, in das nur einmal im Jahr der Hohepriester allein hineinging"). In Bezug auf *Hebr.* 9,5 bittet er: ὅρα τὴν ἐν τῇ Ἐξόδῳ παραγραφὴν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τούτων τόποις (465,16-17: "Siehe den Kommentar in *Exodus* an den einschlägigen Stellen"). Merkwürdig ist, dass er nirgendwo seinen Kommentar zur Apokalypse erwähnt; vielleicht kam dieses exegetische Werk erst später zustande.[30]

B-8200 Brugge-SintMichiels, Kortebrugge 3

[30] Cf. id., *o.c.*, S. XXXIX.

THE CHURCH OF "ST." ACACIUS AT CONSTANTINOPLE

BY

DAVID WOODS

The purpose of this note is to propose a new solution to the apparent contradiction between the so-called *Syriac Breviary* and later Greek and Latin sources concerning the location of the martyrdom of the soldier St. Acacius. The *Syriac Breviary*, which survives in a manuscript dated to 411 and is based on a Greek original which was probably written at Nicomedia about 362, seems to imply that St. Acacius was martyred at Nicomedia.[1] In contrast, the *Hieronymian Martyrology* which was probably written in northern Italy sometime during the period 431-51 sets his martyrdom at Constantinople.[2] It is generally accepted at present that St. Acacius was martyred at Constantinople, and that the *Syriac Breviary* errs in its apparent claim to the contrary. The best one can make of its notice in this matter is that it had been intended to record the special celebration of his feast in Nicomedia rather than his original martyrdom there.[3] The two main arguments in support of his martyrdom at Constantinople rather than Nicomedia are that the ecclesiastical history of Socrates proves the existence of a Church of St. Acacius at Constantinople from an early date and that, whatever its other problems, the surviving Greek passion (*BHG* 13) does indeed set his martyrdom and burial at Constantinople.[4] Yet closer inspection reveals that neither of these sources proves what it has been claimed to prove.

---

[1] See J. de Rossi and L. Duchesne (eds.), *Acta Sanctorum Novembris II.1* (Brussels, 1894), LII-LXV, at LVII. Their Greek translation runs: Ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ Ἀκάκιος μάρτυρ. It dates his feast to 10 May.

[2] See H. Delehaye (ed.), *Acta Sanctorum Novembris II.2: Commentarius Perpetuus in Martyrologium Hieronymianum ad Recensionem Henrici Quentin*, OSB (Brussels, 1931), p. 238. It dates his feast to 8 May and reads: "Constantinopoli Acaci militis et Maximi presbiteri".

[3] So H. Delehaye, *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs* (Brussels, 1933), p. 233, asks: "Avait-il une fête spéciale dans cette ville, ou y a-t-il erreur dans la rubrique?"

[4] See H. Delehaye, "Saints de Thrace et de Mésie", *Analecta Bollandiana* 31 (1912), 161-291, at 228-32. The passion may be found at *PG* 115, cols. 217-40.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

To begin with Socrates, he claims that bishop Macedonius of Constantinople (341-60) transferred the body of Constantine I to the church in which the body of St. Acacius then lay in 359 due to the unsafe condition of the Church of the Holy Apostles at this time.[5] It is important to note, however, that this does not prove the existence of a "Church of St. Acacius" as such at Constantinople by 359, although this is how this passage is normally interpreted.[6] At most, it only proves that Socrates believed that Macedonius had transferred the body to a church which he himself knew as the "Church of St. Acacius" at the time that he was writing c.439, which is a rather different matter.[7] It does not prove that the church had always been known by this exact title, i.e. St. Acacius, nor that it had always contained, or been alleged to contain, the body of St. Acacius. More importantly, there is nothing in the anecdote itself which requires that Macedonius must have believed that it was the "Church of St. Acacius" at the time of his action. He moved Constantine's body there, one suspects, simply because it was the nearest available church. The same argument also applies to Socrates' second anecdote concerning a chapel (οἰκίσκος) dedicated to St. Acacius.[8] According to this story, the emperor Arcadius (395-408) had once visited this chapel which was built near a walnut-tree upon which Acacius was supposed to have been hanged.[9] His presence drew crowds of onlookers from the building within whose courtyard this walnut-tree lay with the result that when this building suddenly collapsed,

---

[5] Soc. *HE* 2.38.40: μεταφέρει τὸ σῶμα τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐν ᾗ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ μάρτυρος Ἀκακίου ἀπέκειτο.

[6] See, e.g., G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une Capitale: Constantinople et ses Institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1984). No source attributes the construction of a Church of St. Acacius to Constantine I before the so-called *Patria of Constantinople*, which are of late date and extremely unreliable. Eusebius of Caesarea claims only that Constantine adorned his city "with very many places of worship, very large martyr-shrines, and splendid houses" (*VC* 3.48.1). Hence modern authorities, e.g. A. Cameron and S. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), p. 297, usually admit only that he *may* have been responsible for the construction of the Church of St. Acacius.

[7] The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*, drawn up under Theodosius II (408-50), proves the existence of an "ecclesiam sive martyrium Sancti Acacii" at this relatively late period anyway.

[8] Soc. *HE* 6.23.2-6. It is not entirely clear whether his two anecdotes refer to the same building.

[9] The passion of Acacius specifically records that he was beheaded with a sword (*PG* 115, col. 239, ch. 22), as one would normally expect. This contradiction is puzzling. If the story is not a totally fictitious local legend, then one wonders whether it may preserve a corrupt memory of the death of another Acacius at this spot, not the military martyr.

no-one was trapped inside and killed. Again, this anecdote does not itself constitute firm proof that the chapel was dedicated to St. Acacius at the time of the alleged incident rather than at the time that Socrates was writing. However, the discovery of two unpublished sermons which bishop John Chryostom (398-404) is supposed to have preached in a "Church of St. Acacius" probably offers sufficient independent testimony to corroborate Socrates' anecdote in this instance, that there was a cult of a St. Acacius at Constantinople by this date, so that we may also assume that there probably was a church of this exact title at Constantinople c.400.[10]

The realisation that Socrates' testimony does not prove that a "Church of St. Acacius" was known as such much before 400 is important in the present context because it is possible to explain the existence of a "Church of Acacius" other than by reference to the martyr of this name. In particular, one notes the possibility that it may have been named after its founder, i.e. that a certain Acacius may have been responsible for the construction of this church. This is an attractive proposition in this case because Eusebius of Caesarea reveals that Constantine I did place a great deal of trust in a certain count Acacius. It was this man, a Christian obviously, whom Constantine ordered to destroy the idols at Mambre in Palestine and to construct a new church there instead.[11] He also trusted him to report to him on the disturbances at Antioch concerning the election of a new

---

[10] I thank Dr. Wendy Mayer for drawing these sermons to my attention and providing transcripts also. The title of one, *In illud: Quia quod stultum est dei* (*CPG* 4441.14), reveals that it was preached ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ Ἀκακίον τὸν μάρτυρα while the title of the other, *In martyres omnes* (*CPG* 4441.15), reveals that it was preached ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Ἀκακίου. I do not wish to be diverted into a discussion of whether there was more than one church or shrine dedicated to St. Acacius at this period, and which it was in which John Chrysostom actually preached if there was more than one. The key point here is that, taken together, the evidence does support the existence of a cult of St. Acacius at Constantinople c.400, even if, in isolation, one might well question whether the titles of Chrysostom's homilies might not have been amended by a late editor to refer to a "Church of St. Acacius" rather than a "Church of Acacius", an important distinction as we shall see next.

[11] Eus. *VC* 3.52. This is a letter in which Constantine I himself describes Acacius as a "most distinguished count and friend". See *PLRE* 1, p. 6, s.v. Acacius 4. This Acacius may be identifiable with the Acacius who was *comes Macedoniae* in 327, *C.Th.* 11.3.2. We do not know anything about the date or circumstances of his death, which raises the possibility that the story about the hanging of St. Acacius on a walnut-tree may actually relate to him instead. If so, one is tempted to associate his execution with that of other of Constantine I's favourites immediately after his death. In general, see M. DiMaio, "*Per vim, per caedem, per bellum*: A Study of Murder and Ecclesiastical Politics in the Year 337 AD", *Byzantion* 62 (1992), 158-211.

bishop there c.326.[12] Hence a church originally known as the "Church of Acacius" after its founder may have become known as the "Church of St. Acacius" in time by the same process which saw the creation of several fictitious saints in other cities also.[13] The difference this time, though, was that there was a genuine martyr whose passion could be used to explain the origin of the name of the "Church of St. Acacius" at Constantinople without recourse to the worst excesses of pious fiction, the Acacius who had originally been martyred at Nicomedia.

Support for this thesis can also be found in the location of the so-called "Church of St. Acacius", the place where his body was supposed to lie according to Socrates. Acacius' passion records that he was buried in a place called The Staurion, and although its exact location has not yet been discovered, it is generally agreed that it was located near the Golden Horn and within the Constantinian walls.[14] The interesting point here is that the Church of St. Mocius, a priest who was also martyred at Constantinople during the Diocletianic persecution, lay outside the Constantinian walls in the opposite direction.[15] In so far as we may assume that it was built at or near the site of Mocius' burial, this suggests that the cemetery in use at the time of the Diocletianic persecution was far removed from the alleged burial site of St. Acacius, i.e. that he could not have been buried at the site of the so-called "Church of St. Acacius" had he really died at Constantinople. This raises the question whether the "Church of St. Acacius" did not get its name instead as a result of the translation there at some point of his relics from Nicomedia. For example, the earthquake which devastated Nicomedia in 358 and killed its bishop Cecropius may have provided one opportunity for such action.[16] This was a time when all concerned were

---

[12] Eus. *VC* 3.62.

[13] E.g. the Pudens who founded the late 4th-century *titulus Pudentis* at Rome, or the *ecclesia Pudentiana* as it was described in a mosaic, had been transformed into a saint by the 6th century, as had the founders of many other *tituli*. He was then identified with his homonym at 2 *Tim.* 4.21. In general, see R. Krautheimer, S. Corbett, and W. Frankl (eds.), *Corpus Basilicarum Romae III* (Vatican, 1967), pp. 277-302.

[14] R. Janin, *Constantinople Byzantine: Développement urbain et repertoire topographique* (Paris, 1950), p. 343.

[15] The church has not itself been found, but it is assumed to have lent its name to the so-called Cistern of St. Mocius allegedly built by Anastasius I (491-518).

[16] Soz. *HE* 4.16.5. If this earthquake has any relevance at all, it is probably because it provides the best explanation of why the church at Constantinople was able to succeed in its claim that Acacius had really died there. One suspects that it probably destroyed whatever shrine the real St. Acacius had already merited at Nicomedia, so

anxious to enhance the dignity of Constantinople by acquiring new relics for its churches, as witnessed by the translation there of the relics of Ss. Luke and Andrew in 359,[17] but it remains difficult to explain why no source attests such a translation if it did in fact occur. More importantly, while it is obvious why all concerned should have been eager to acquire the relics of the apostle Andrew in particular for the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, it is not clear why they should have wished to obtain those of St. Acacius, unless they had a church named after an Acacius whom they were already identifying with the martyr from Nicomedia, which returns us to my original thesis.[18]

This brings us to the surviving passion of St. Acacius. This no more proves the truth of the *Hieronymian Martyrology* in this matter than does Socrates' testimony. In fact, it proves the opposite to be true. If one ignores the wordy excesses of this passion as it survives, and concentrates on those basic elements of the narrative which most probably preserve the earliest features of this tradition, then one allegation more than anything else causes one to doubt whether this text preserves anything of value, the claim that Acacius' persecutors sent him for trial from Perinthus to the proconsul of Europa, Flaccinus, at Byzantium.[19] Ignoring the fact that the governor of

---

removing the locus for celebration and effectively extinguishing the cult before it had gained sufficient popular momentum to continue. One is inclined to believe that if St. Acacius' shrine at Nicomedia had ever possessed his relics, then they were probably buried for good at this time. For the extent of the destruction, see Amm. Marc. 17.7.1-8, 22.9.3-4.

[17] See D. Woods, "The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople", *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991), 286-92. These were the first relics known to have been translated to Constantinople.

[18] It is noteworthy that there is no evidence that the "Church of St. Acacius" ever did possess any corporeal relics which it was able either to display or divide for redistribution elsewhere. One is reminded of the growth of the cult of St. Demetrius at Thessalonica despite the fact that the authorities there had no corporeal relics to substantiate their claims and simply assumed, in time, that their patron was buried somewhere beneath his church. See J.C. Skedros, *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki: Civic Patron and Divine Protector 4th-7th Centuries CE* (Harrisburg, 1999), pp. 85-88. But if the "Church of St. Acacius" did possess the remains of a certain Acacius, i.e. if there was a tomb of a certain Acacius present there for all to see, then it need not to have been the tomb of the martyr rather than of some dignitary of this name whose wealth and prestige had ensured his burial within the church itself, the donor of the church even as I will argue next.

[19] *PG* 115, col. 237. The 11th-century *Synaxary of Constantinople* preserves a corrupt reading of his name as Falcillianus, while failing to preserve his full title. See H. Delehaye (ed.), *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris* (Brussels, 1902), p. 661.

the late Roman province of Europa did not rank as a proconsul, only as a consularis, even by c.401,[20] one notes that Perinthus was the capital of the province of Europa, and that his immediate superiors ought not to have had to send Acacius anywhere had they merely wanted to deliver him to the authority of the provincial governor. The solution to this problem lies in the realisation that the Flaccinus of the passion is identifiable with the Flaccinus whom Lactantius identifies as prefect in 303.[21] The context of Lactantius' statement proves that Flaccinus was present at Nicomedia in 303 as the praetorian prefect of either Diocletian or Galerius Maximianus.[22] It is arguable, therefore, that the passion of Acacius had originally described his transfer to the jurisdiction of the praetorian prefect Flaccinus at Nicomedia, but that Flaccinus' title and the location where he presided over Acacius' trial were changed at a later stage in the tradition in order to support Constantinople's new claim upon this martyr. Hence the passion lends credence to the *Syriac Breviary*'s claim that Acacius died in Nicomedia.

The realisation that the passion of St. Acacius deserves more credence than it has hitherto received and that its worst problems can be explained as the result of Constantinopolitan re-editing at an early date in order to support its claim to possess the relics of St. Acacius requires a brief re-examination of the evidence for the date of his death.[23] The fact that Flaccinus tried Acacius at Nicomedia proves that the emperor whom he served must have been present at Nicomedia also. More specifically, since

---

[20] *Not. Dig. Or.* 1.72.

[21] Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 16.4. Lactantius' work has left no traces in the Byzantine historiographical tradition, and there is no possibility that the author of the passion borrowed Flaccinus' name from this text.

[22] T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), p. 126.

[23] Another problem which has resulted from the re-editing of this passion down the ages is the description of Acacius as a centurion. The passion reports that Acacius belonged to a unit called the Martenses, but we can now identify this as one of the new type of units raised by Diocletian during his reforms of the army and which did not include this traditional grade. See, e.g., W. Treadgold, *Byzantium and Its Army 284-1081* (Stanford, 1995), p. 90. In fact, the passion describes Acacius as a centurion on one occasion only, in a passage where an attempt to translate the Roman title *Martenses* as Ἀρείοι in Greek reveals a late hand at work (*PG* 115, col. 220, ch. 2). Otherwise Acacius is described simply as a "soldier" (στρατιώτης), which should have been interpreted to mean "private" in the modern military sense, i.e. as a description of rank as much as occupation, although a later editor clearly failed to realise this. This would bring the passion into agreement with the evidence of the *Hieronymian Martyrology* which also describes Acacius as a *miles*, i.e. a "private".

the *Syriac Breviary* commemorates his feast on 10 May, Acacius must have been executed in a year when an emperor remained present at Nicomedia up to 10 May at least. Since Diocletian and his Caesar Galerius Maximianus had both left Nicomedia by mid-March 303, this excludes that year.[24] Diocletian only returned to Nicomedia during late 304, and Galerius only returned there in March 305. They then remained together at Nicomedia until 1 May 305 when Diocletian declared Galerius his successor as senior emperor and retired to private life. While there is no clear evidence for the whereabouts of Galerius in 306, the fact that he fought a campaign against the Sarmatians either in late 306 or early 307 and was able to invade Italy itself in the summer of 307, suggests that he had returned to his European possessions shortly after his accession as Augustus. Certainly, there is no evidence for his return to Nicomedia after the summer of 305. Hence the evidence suggests that Acacius was martyred on 10 May 305.

In conclusion, the evidence suggests that the so-called "Church of St. Acacius" at Constantinople was originally known as the "Church of Acacius", after its founder, one of Constantine I's most senior Christian officials. It was only at a later date that it came to be associated with St. Acacius of Nicomedia, a process which was complete by c.400 at latest. The surprisingly short time-scale involved here is reminiscent of a similar misunderstanding concerning the Church of St. Paul at Constantinople. This church was named after bishop Paul of Constantinople (342-50) when his remains were finally returned to his see and laid to rest there c.381. Yet Sozomen reveals that by his day c.440 many people believed that the church really took its name from the apostle St. Paul and that it was his remains which it possessed.[25] Hence the *Syriac Breviary* and the *Hieronymian Martyrology* do not so much contradict one another as provide an insight into a key stage in the transformation of the cult of St. Acacius as a result of the acquisitiveness of Constantine's new capital at the expense of its neighbour and rival Nicomedia.[26]

Dpt of Ancient Classics University College Cork, Eire

---

[24] For what follows, see Barnes (n. 22) on Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 17-19.

[25] Soz. *HE* 7.10; also Soc. *HE* 5.9.

[26] In general, see C. Foss, "Nicomedia and Constantinople", in C. Mango and G. Dagron (eds.), *Constantinople and Its Hinterland* (Aldershot, 1995), pp. 181-90.

PATRISTISCHER HINTERGRUND IM 12. GEISTLICHEN LIED DES NOVALIS

VON

VINZENZ BUCHHEIT

Bekanntlich hat das 12. Geistliche Lied des Novalis[1] das katholische Kirchenlied „O Heyland, reiß die Himmel auff" des Jesuiten Friedrich von Spee mit dem Titel „Der Altväter Verlangen nach dem Messias" zum Vorbild.[2] Wiederholt hat man auch auf die Einwirkung der frühromantischen Religiosität hingewiesen.[3] Übersehen ist bislang, dass der Dichter, auf welchem Weg auch immer, von einer Tradition Kenntnis gehabt hat, wie sie frühchristliche Exegese und Dichtung zu erkennen geben.

Wo bleibst du Trost der ganzen Welt?
Herberg ist dir schon längst bestellt.
Verlangend sieht ein jedes dich,
Und öffnet deinem Segen sich.

Geuß, Vater, ihn gewaltig aus,
Gib ihn aus deinem Arm heraus:
Nur Unschuld, Lieb und süße Scham
Hielt ihn, daß er nicht längst schon kam.

Treib ihn von dir in unsern Arm,
Daß er von deinem Hauch noch warm;
In schweren Wolken sammle ihn
Und laß ihn so hernieder ziehn.

In kühlen Strömen send ihn her,
In Feuerflammen lodre er,
In Luft und Öl, in Klang und Tau
Durchdring er unsrer Erde Bau.

---

[1] HKA I[3]. Leicht zugänglich auch in der Reclam-Ausgabe von J. Mahr, *Novalis. Gedichte. Die Lehrlinge zu Sais*, (Stuttgart 1984) 118f.

[2] Vgl. u.a. W. Vesper, Das Vorbild zu Hardenbergs ‚Wo bleibst du Trost der ganzen Welt', *Euphorion* 15 (1908) 568-570; H. Uerlings, *Friedrich von Hardenberg, genannt Novalis. Werk und Forschung*, (Stuttgart 1991) 264-270.

[3] Zuletzt bes. Uerlings a.O. 264ff.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001
Vigiliae Christianae 55, 208-214

So wird der heilge Kampf gekämpft,
So wird der Hölle Grimm gedämpft,
Und ewig blühend geht allhier
Das alte Paradies herfür.

Die Erde regt sich, grünt und lebt,
Des Geistes voll ein jedes strebt
Den Heiland lieblich zu empfahn
Und beut die vollen Brüst ihm an.

Der Winter weicht, ein neues Jahr
Steht an der Krippe Hochaltar.
Es ist das erste Jahr der Welt,
Die sich dies Kind erst selbst bestellt.

Die Augen sehn den Heiland wohl,
Und doch sind sie des Heilands voll,
Von Blumen wird sein Haupt geschmückt,
Aus denen er selbst holdselig blickt.

Er ist der Stern, er ist die Sonn,
Er ist des ewgen Lebens Bronn,
Aus Kraut und Stein und Meer und Licht
Schimmert sein kindlich Angesicht.

In allen Dingen sein kindlich Tun.
Seine heiße Liebe wird nimmer ruhn,
Er schmiegt sich seiner unbewußt
Unendlich fest an jede Brust.

Ein Gott für uns, ein Kind für sich
Liebt er uns all herzinniglich,
Wird unsre Speis und unser Trank,
Treusinn ist ihm der liebste Dank.

Das Elend wächst je mehr und mehr,
Ein düstrer Gram bedrückt uns sehr,
Laß, Vater, den Geliebten gehn,
Mit uns wirst du ihn wieder sehn. (HKA I)

Während die adventlichen Aspekte bei Spee weitgehend von Jesaias her (45,8 *rorate, caeli, desuper et nubes pluant iustum; aperiatur terra, et germinet Salvatorem, et iustitia oriatur simul*) verständlich werden, ist dies bei Novalis keineswegs der Fall. Er hat den entscheidenden Passus (*rorate, caeli . . .*) *allenfalls* in den Versen fünf („*Geuß, Vater, ihn gewaltig aus*") und elf („*in schweren Wolken sammle ihn*") anklingen lassen. Ansonsten ist die starke Divergenz von Spee durch die bereits erwähnte Deutung der Väter mitbestimmt worden.

Dies betrifft insbesondere den Mittelteil mit dem soteriologischen Aspekt „So *ward der heilge Kampf gekämpft, so wird der Hölle Grimm gedämpft*", der fester Bestandteil christlicher Exegese in Weihnachts- und Osterhymnen bzw. – Homilien war.[4] Wichtiger ist freilich, dass der Dichter diesen in der christlichen Soteriologie[5] insgesamt geläufigen Hintergrund ergänzt durch die dadurch erzielte Wirkung:

Und ewig blühend geht allhier
Das alte Paradies herfür. (19f.).

Die Erde regt sich, grünt und lebt,
Des Geistes voll ein jedes strebt ... (21ff.)

Dies basiert generell auf einer kosmischen Christophanie, wie sie im Hymnus insgesamt vorwaltet. Eine solche muss aber nicht durch Jakob Böhme veranlasst sein,[6] sondern ist schon in frühchristlicher Exegese und in Weihnachtshymnen angelegt.[7] Vor allem das bei Novalis anklingende dreiphasige Weltmodell (frühlingshaft-paradiesische Urphase – Verlust – dauerhafte und gesteigerte Wiederkehr des ursprünglichen Paradieses), illustriert mit Hilfe des Frühlingsmotivs, hat schon das frühe Christentum unter Verwertung vergilischer Ansätze[8] aus biblischem Hintergrund entwickelt.[9]

Da ist zunächst auf einen grundsätzlichen Aspekt hinzuweisen, der fest in der Bibel verankert ist:[10] Nach patristischer Vorstellung gehören alle Naturerscheinungen deshalb zu den *optima*, weil Gott ihr Urgrund (*auctor naturae*)[11] ist. Dies war verbunden mit der Tendenz, die natürliche Ebene, ohne sie zu entwerten, durch die spirituelle zu überhöhen, so dass Frühlingselemente auf doppelter Ebene auslegbar werden. Zu Hilfe kam den symbolfreudigen Vätern ein weiterer Symbolbereich, der mit ‚Acker –

---

[4] Nachweise bei V. Buchheit, Göttlicher Heilsplan bei Prudentius (Cath. 11, 25-48), *Vig. Christ.* 44 (1990) 227ff.

[5] Lit. bei Verf., *Vig. Christ.* 44 (1990) 239, Anm. 114; vgl. nur den von Picaneder stammenden Schlußchor im Weihnachtsoratorium von J.S. Bach.

[6] So Paschek bei Uerlings a.O. 266, Anm. 38.

[7] Vgl. V. Buchheit, Sonnenwende – Geburt des Sol verus (Prud. Cath. 11, 1-22), *Wien. Stud.* 99 (1986) 245ff.

[8] Nachweise bei V. Buchheit, Heimkehr ins Paradies, *Philologus* 136, (1992) 256-273, bes. 257ff., 267ff.

[9] Vgl. bes. *Gen.* 1f.: *Psalm.* 18,1; *Sap.* 13,5; *Joh. 1; Röm.* 1,20; 8, 19ff.; *Ephes.* 1,10; *Koloss.* 1, 15ff.; ferner V. Buchheit, Goldene Zeit und Paradies auf Erden (Laktanz, inst. 5, 5-8), *Würzb. Jahrb.* 4 (1978) 161-185; 5 (1979) 219-235.

[10] Texte wie Anm. 9

[11] Tert. *Cult. Fem.* 1, 8, 2.

Pflanzung – Wachstum' umschrieben werden kann: Christus ist der Sämann, Kirche und Seele sind Acker und Pflanzung.[12] Ebenso hilfreich wurde, dass auch der frühchristlichen Exegese die Annahme geläufig war, die Urschöpfung habe sich im Frühling vollzogen.[13] Folgerichtig spielten die reale Ebene des Frühlingsgeschehens und ihre spirituelle Deutung bei der liturgischen Ausgestaltung des Osterfestes, der Taufe und des Weihnachtsfestes eine besondere Rolle.[14] Für Letzteres stützte man sich vor allem auf den Taufpsalm 22, Vers 2: *in loco pascuae* bzw. *in loco viridi . . . me locavit.*

Dichterische Gestaltung gefunden hat dies in zwei Tagesliedern des Prudentius. In seinem Hymnus auf das Weihnachtsfest (cath. 11) sind bislang erwähnte Vorstellungen zu bildhafter Dichte vereint. Die Wiederkehr des Paradieses setzt ein mit der Geburt des Messias, wobei kosmisches Geschehen der Wintersonnenwende und heilsgeschichtliche Ausdeutung zusammenfinden:[15] Eine große Freude für die Welt enthalte der reine Schoß Mariens, aus dem ein *novellum saeculum* hervorgehe und eine *lux aurea* (11,57ff.). Das Ereignis ist geschildert mit den Farben der goldenen Zeit. Anklänge an Vergiltexte ordnen sich der aus AT und NT gewonnenen Deutung unter. Der Schrei des Neugeborenen habe die Erneuerung des Erdkreises im Frühling hervorgebracht, die wiedergeborene Erde den Schmutz der alten vertrieben. Die Wirkung war:

Sparsisse tellurem reor
Rus omne densis floribus.

Auch in der ganzen unbelebten Natur habe sich das Wunder der Erneuerung vollzogen, und der Menschheit sei der Weg zur Heimkehr ins Paradies eröffnet worden.

Im achten Tageslied (cath. 8) begegnet diese Symbolik bei der Deutung der Fabel vom Guten Hirten (8,33-48).[16] Die darauf bezogenen beiden ersten Strophen handeln von der Verstrickung des unerlösten Menschen in die schuldhafte Gottferne und von der Befreiung daraus durch den Guten Hirten (8,33-40). Die beiden folgenden Strophen führen den Vorgang

---

[12] Vgl. *Philologus* 136 (1992) 263f.

[13] Ebda, 264. 266; dazu Aponius, Komm. z. Hohen Lied (*Cant. 2, 11* = Migne, PL Suppl. 1, 866f.).

[14] Vgl. Th. Michels, Das Frühjahrssymbol in österlicher Liturgie, Rede und Dichtung des christlichen Altertums, *Jahrb. Liturgiewiss.* 6 (1926) 1-15 = *Sarmenta. Gesammelte Studien von Th. M.* (Münster 1972) 1-15; Buchheit, *Philologus* 136 (1992) 257ff.

[15] Im Einzelnen erläutert bei Buchheit, *Wien. Stud.* 99 (1986) 245ff.

[16] Dazu Verf., Ovis spinosa (Prud. cath. 8, 33-40), *Philologus* 134 (1990) 50-65.

der Erlösung durch die Taufe vor Augen: „Auch bringt er (Christus) das Schaf wieder auf Wiesen und grüne Auen (*et pratis viridique campo*) zurück, wo kein Dorn mit struppigen Kletten zittert und keine stachlige Distel ihre Sprösslinge mit Dornen bewaffnet. Vielmehr gedeiht ein Hain voller Palmen, und das wiedergewonnene Laub auf den Stengeln grünt neu im Frühling (*vernat*); immergrüner Lorbeer umschattet den gläsernen Strom voll lebendigen Wassers".

Erneut sind die realen Erscheinungen in der Natur und der spirituelle Sinn zu eindringlicher Einheit geführt: Frühling – Vegetation – Taufe – Erlösung – Heimkehr ins Paradies. Ist im Weihnachtshymnus der Frühling als Zeichen einer universalkosmischen Erneuerung verstanden, wird im achten Tageslied die Teilnahme des Einzelnen an dieser neuen Frühlingswelt erkennbar. Es überrascht nicht, dass Prudentius auch schon das Ursprungsparadies in Eden mit ähnlichen Farben geschildert hat:

Tunc per amoena virecta iubet
frondicomis habitare locis,
ver ubi perpetuum redolet,
prataque multicolora latex
quadrifluo celer amne rigat (cath. 3, 101-105).[17]

(„Dann lädt er ihn ein, auf lieblich – grüner Au in laubgeschmückter Flur zu wohnen, wo sich der Duft ewigen Frühlings verströmt und ein eilendes Wasser in vierfacher Strömung buntfarbene Wiesen benetzt")

Einen ähnlichen Bezugsrahmen kann man im Lied des Novalis für die inhaltlich sich anschließenden Verse 25ff. ermitteln:

Der Winter weicht, ein neues Jahr
Steht an der Krippe Hochaltar . . .

Den Ausgangspunkt für das Verständnis bilden Psalm. 73, 16f.: . . . *aestatem et ver tu plasmasti ea*, sowie Cant. 2, 11-13: *iam enim hiems transiit . . . flores apparuerunt in terra nostra, tempus putationis advenit. . . .* Beide Texte sind in der Exegese stets auf Christus als den Schöpfer von Winter und Frühling und den Bringer des geistigen Frühlings der Erlösung bezogen. Aus der Fülle der Belege seien exemplarisch die Folgenden ausgewählt:

Gregor von Nyssa lässt in seinem Kommentar zum Hohen Lied[18] die letzte Stufe seiner dreiphasigen Heilsgeschichte beginnen mit dem Kommen Christi, das den Frühling der Seelen geschenkt und so das Aufblühen der

[17] Ähnlich Cento Probae 163 (wozu Verf., *Grazer Beitr.* 15 (1988) 173); Mar. Vict. *Aleth.* I 225ff.; Isid. Sev. *Etym.* 14, 3, 2; Abaelard, *Hexah.* (Migne, PL 178, 750a).

[18] *In Cant.* V p. 151 sqq. Langerbeck (zu Cant. 2, 11f.).

Tugenden bewirkt habe. Ambrosius erläutert in seinem Kommentar zum Hexahemeron (4, 5, 22):[19] *ante adventum Christi hiems erat, post adventum flores sunt veris.* Zeno von Verona spricht in einer Predigt zum Ostersonntag[20] nach der Ausmalung der Frühlingszeit von der Notwendigkeit der Taufe, die er als *ver, sacrum fontem* bezeichnet; ihre Folge seien *ecclesiae flores clarissimi.* In einer Weihnachtshomilie, die Johannes Chrysostomos zugeschrieben wird (Migne, PG 61, 763), werden realer und heilsgeschichtlicher Frühling aufeinander bezogen: „Wenn nach kaltem Winter die warme Milde des Frühlings aufbricht, sprießt Vegetation, erfasst die Schöpfung insgesamt Freude und Wandel zum Besseren. Dass uns aber nun Christus, der himmlische Frühling . . ., aufgeleuchtet ist und die frostigen und stürmischen Wolken des Teufels verjagt und die schläfrigen Herzen der Menschen aus dem Nebel der Unwissenheit durch sein göttliches Licht zum Leben erweckt sind, lässt uns unseren Sinn aufrichten hin zur Glückseligkeit der himmlischen Herrlichkeit".[21]

Dieses Ineinander von Wintersolstitium – Geburt Christi – Heilsgeschehen ist in dieser Art weder bei Jakob Böhme[22] noch im pietistischen Umfeld des Novalis belegt, sondern entstammt der erwähnten patristischen Tradition, die gerade über die Auslegung des Hohen Liedes im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit bis hin zu Herder,[23] mit dem Novalis wie fast alle bedeutenden Zeitgenossen bestens vertraut war, geläufig blieb.

Und Christus als Stern und Sonne (*er ist der Stern, er ist die Sonn*, V. 39) ist in der reichen Lichtmetaphorik und -symbolik des Weihnachtsgeschehens spätestens seit dem vierten Jahrhundert, gefördert durch zahlreiche alt- wie neutestamentliche Texte, sowie durch das Rivalisieren mit dem paganen *Sol invictus*,[24] fest verankert.

---

[19] Vgl. ferner *Virgin*, 54; *Isaac*, 4, 35f. und oft.

[20] *Tract.* 1,33 Löfstedt = 2,45 Migne; vgl. *tract.* 2,13 Löfstedt = 2,53 Migne; die *salubris unda* (Taufe) habe in einem *ver arridens diversos flores* hervorgebracht. – Auch Augustinus war diese Winter-Frühling-Metaphorik vertraut; mir lagen die Lemmata der gespeicherten Wortkonkordanz zu Augustinus vor.

[21] Dabei begegnet erstmals das Bild vom ‚Frühling des Herzens', das bei Hölderlin so nachdrücklich hervortritt (Gregor v. Nyssa, *Komm. z. Hohen Lied* 2, 11f.; Ambros. *Virgin.* 54).

[22] Dessen Mitwirkung bei der Entfaltung dieses Symbolbereichs durch Novalis regelmäßig überschätzt wird.

[23] Hierzu Buchheit, *Wien.Stud.* 99 (1986) 246ff.; zur Deutungsgeschichte des Hohen Liedes s. u. a. F. Ohly, *Hoheliedstudien* (Wiesbaden 1958); U. Köpf, *TRE* 15, 508-513 (512f. Lit.).

[24] Dazu Buchheit, Sonnenwende – Geburt des Sol verus (Prud. cath. 11, 1-12), *Wien. Stud.* 99 (1986) 245ff. Auch das zwölfte Geistliche Lied legt Zeugnis ab für Novalis durchgängige Tendenz, christliche und heidnische Religion miteinander auszusöhnen.

Insgesamt ist festzuhalten, dass die Struktur des in dem zwölften Geistlichen Lied erkennbaren Weltmodells und die Frühlingsmetaphorik ihren Rückhalt im gesamten Werk des Novalis haben. Schon der frühe Dichter idealisiert die Urzeit als eine göttlich-frühlingshafte Phase und lässt in ihr die Poesie entstehen.[25] Gemäß triadischem Weltbild des Novalis[26] bedeutet dies, dass seine Poesie und der sie wirkende Dichter Träger und Vermittler dieser frühlingshaften, will sagen ursprünglich goldenen Zeit sind und den Auftrag haben, ihrer Zeit den verlorenen Urzustand neu zu vermitteln. Kein Wunder, dass wir dem so verstandenen Frühlingsmotiv im späteren Werk immer dann begegnen, wenn der Dichter solche Wegweisung entfaltet, so vor allem in den ‚Lehrlingen zu Sais' (HKA I³ 94), im ‚Heinrich von Ofterdingen' (HKA I³ 224f., 270f., 312f.), in den Gedichten ‚Der Fremdling' und ‚An Tieck'.

Darüber hinaus ist Hardenberg mit dem Frühlingsmotiv, wie es uns besonders bei Vergil und Hölderlin begegnet,[27] wohlvertraut. Erinnert sei nur an die häufig verwendeten Motivkreise ‚Kind und Frühling',[28] ‚Liebe und Frühling'[29] und daran, dass auch Novalis die Vorstellung kennt, einige wenige, denen die Seele der Natur noch vertraut ist, reichten mit ihren Wurzeln in die frühlingshafte Urzeit zurück und bildeten so die Keimzelle des „neuen Reiches", in dem ewiger Frühling herrschen werde: die ‚Fremdlinge' aus Atlantis, die Dichter und Weisen.

Dass sich diese Motivik bei Vergil, Hölderlin[30] und Novalis gleichermaßen findet, hat mit der Gleichgestimmtheit verwandter Dichternaturen zu tun und basiert auf demselben dreiphasigen Weltmodell.

35392 Gießen, Am Zollstock 15 VINZENZ BUCHHEIT

---

[25] Vgl. Buchheit, Scaliger und Novalis über den Ursprung von Musik und Dichtung, *Würzb. Jahrb.* 20 (1994/95) 257-271.

[26] Dazu grundlegend H.J. Mähl, *Die Idee des goldenen Zeitalters im Werk des Novalis* (Heidelberg 1965); Ders.; Der poetische Staat, in: Utopieforschung (Frankfurt 1985) Bd. 3, 273-302.

[27] Vgl. Buchheit, Frühling bei Vergil und Hölderlin, *Euphorion* 91 (1997) 157-181.

[28] So neben dem zwölften Geistlichen Lied auch in ‚Die Lehrlinge zu Sais', im ‚Heinrich von Ofterdingen' und in ‚An Tieck'.

[29] Vgl. nur die Fabel ‚Giasar und Azora', mit wörtlichen Bezügen wieder im Märchen ‚Hyazint und Rosenblütchen' aufgenommen (HAK I³ 94f.), in ‚Die Blumen', mehrfach im Ofterdingenroman und in ‚Es färbte sich die Wiese grün'. Dieses Gedicht ist in Struktur und Aussage von Hölderlins Thaliafragment (*StA* III 167ff.) und dem ‚Hyperion' (*StA* III 47ff.) beeinflusst.

[30] Für Novalis ist direkte Kenntnis der Hymnen des Prudentius durchaus denkbar, möglicherweise durch Herder vermittelt; vgl. J.G. Herder, *Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität, 7. Sammlung*, Nr. 82 = Bd. 18, S. 15, hrsg. v. B. Suphan: Herder zitiert aus cath. 10.

REVIEWS

P. Borgen, K. Fuglseth, R. Skarsten, *The Philo Index. A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria.* Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, and Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2000. xi + 371 pages. ISBN 0-8028-3883-9 (Eerdmans), 90-04-11477-7 (Brill). $55.

The Jewish exegete and philosopher Philo of Alexandria had a strong impact on the thought and exegesis of the writers of the early Church. Therefore his writings are of great relevance to patristic scholars. Among the more important instruments available for consulting his voluminous oeuvre are indices. The first index was compiled by I. Leisegang and was published as volume seven of the critical edition of Philo's writings by L. Cohn, P. Wendland, and S. Reiter (Berlin 1926, 1930). In this index each lemma is subdivided according to the different meanings of a word, and the context of a word is cited. Therefore, it is a very useful tool but it has the disadvantage that it refers to page and line numbers of the critical edition; so it can only be consulted in combination with that edition. Moreover it is incomplete, only containing key words. In 1974 G. Mayer published his index, which shows two important differences compared with Leisegang's index. It does not indicate the context of a word and the entries are not subdivided. Mayer, using numbers for indicating the writings, refers to the paragraph numbering.

In 1997 a group of Norwegian Philonic scholars published a printout of a database containing all the Greek words in Philo's writings. This index has now been published in a definite form by Eerdmans and Brill. The book has a hard cover and a fine layout. The letters and numbers are large enough for comfortable use. The index resembles Mayer's one, but differs from its predecessor in some respects. It is even more complete, containing all the Greek words, except δέ, καί, and ὁ. At each entry the total number of occurrences is also given. It includes the main Greek fragments from *Quaestiones in Genesim et Exodum, De Providentia* and *Hypothetica.* References to the Philonic writings are made by abbreviations of the titles, and not by numbers.

I shall now give an example how a patristic scholar can use this index. In his work *De vita Moysis* the Cappadocian Church father Gregory of

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Nyssa connects the royal way (Num. 20:17, 21:22) with the Aristotelian ethical doctrine that virtue is found in the middle between two extremities (II.288). As remarked by the commentators, Gregory derives this interpretation form Philo's *Quod Deus immutabilis sit* 162-164. He does, however, not only offer a Philonic exegesis, but he uses also Philonic words. The highway of virtue is contrasted with ἀνοδία—a road that is no road. The word ἀνοδία is not frequently used; LSJ refers to a few writers, among whom Philo. A search in the Philo index shows that Philo employs this word twenty times, and so it seems that it is characteristic of Philo. Both Philo and Gregory employ the word ἀνοδία in a metaphorical way for indicating the deviation from the highway of virtue. The Philonic character of the passage in Gregory's *De vita Moysis* is strengthened by his use of the word ἀνοδία.

The Philo index is a fine achievement of the Norwegian Philo group. I am certain that it will be a most valuable tool for tracing Philonic influence in the Church fathers, and for this reason indispensable for patristic scholars engaged in such research.

NL-4206 VD *Gorinchem*, IJsbaan 175 A.C. GELJON

Avit de Vienne, *Histoire spirituelle. Tome I (Chants I-III)*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Nicole Hecquet-Noti (Sources Chrétiennes 444), Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 334 p., FF 173 (broché).

Alexander Arweiler, *Die Imitation antiker und spätantiker Literatur in der Dichtung 'De spiritalis historiae gestis' des Alcimus Avitus. Mit einem Kommentar zu Avit. carm. 4, 429-540 und 5, 526-703* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 52), Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1999. 384 p., DM 248 (Geb.).

Sans aucun doute l'épopée chrétienne a droit à l'existence. On y trouve des histoires bibliques en forme poétique, racontées par des hommes érudits et versés dans la culture classique. Bien qu'il aille sans dire que les poètes chrétiens n'atteignent pas le niveau de leurs grands prédécesseurs païens, ils arrivent bien à ajouter quelque chose d'originel à leur exemples. Grâce à leur volonté d'*aemulatio* il leur est donné de 'corriger' les *mendacia poetarum*.

Parmi ces versificateurs chrétiens se trouve Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, évêque de Vienne (près de Lyon) qui publie aux alentours de l'an 500 un texte intitulé *De spiritalis historiae gestis ('Histoire sprituelle')*. Cette oeuvre comprend cinq chants: 1. Le début du monde; 2. Le péché originel; 3. Le

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

jugement divin; 4. Le déluge; 5. La traversée de la Mer Rouge. But du poème est la glorification du Christ comme héros universel.

En 1999 deux publications sur l'épopée d'Avit ont vu le jour. On pourrait donc assumer un intérêt renouvelé pour cet ouvrage merveilleux. A paru dans la collection dite des *Sources Chrétiennes* N. Hecquet-Noti, *Avit de Vienne—Histoire spirituelle. Tome I (Chants I-III)*. Ce livre est le résultat d'un remaniement d'une thèse de doctorat soutenue en 1994 à l'université de Genève. Que ces quelques remarques suffisent à juger ce travail à ses mérites. 1. On cherche en vain dans la bibliographie l'étude fondamentale de H. Hagendahl, *The Latin Fathers and the Classics*, Göteborg 1958. 2. P. 227: Le vers II, 299 est: *illis subpeteret recta si sorte potestas*. De vue prosodique on devrait lier *recta* à *sorte* et traduire: 'si le pouvoir leur était donné par un juste sort' etc. N'empêche que ce numéro des *Sources Chrétiennes* fournisse à l'étudiant d'Avit une bonne occasion de se familiariser avec cette poésie.

Il y aurait à dire bien davantage de la seconde publication: A. Arweiler, *Die Imitation antiker und spätantiker Literatur in der Dichtung 'De spiritalis historiae gestis' des Alcimus Avitus*. Remaniement lui aussi d'une thèse de doctorat (soutenu en 1997/98 à l'université de Bonn), ce livre volumineux témoigne d'une manque d'argumentation persévérée. On y trouve bien une introduction mais aucune conclusion. Il se pourrait que la version originale pourvoirât à combler cette lacune, mais le lecteur ingénu n'y apprend rien. Aux pages 340-1 se trouve un passage qui pourrait être conçu comme une argumentation: 'PEIPER hat in seinem Index besonders viele Parallelen aus den Werken des Vergil und Sidonius angeführt. Daraus ist die These, Avit. habe diese beiden Autoren zu Hauptvorbilden gewählt, als Tatsache in die Handbücher übernommen worden. Sie kann aber nach den in dieser Arbeit bisher vorgelegten Ergebnissen nur noch stark relativierte Geltung beanspruchen, da sie der complexen Imitationstechnik des Avit. nicht gerecht wird'. Cette remarque, tout en excitant la curiosité, semble aussitôt être oubliée par l'auteur, qui imperturbablement continue ses recherches détaillées. Cette conception d'Arweiler ne se rejouissant en aucun soutien argumentateur, il vaudrait mieux se tenir au propos de Hecquet-Noti, p. 38: 'Le modèle de cette poésie est, bien sûr, *l'Énéide*'.

En plus, le travail d'Arweiler contient des imprécisions. À la page 19, Avit. 4, 619 n'est pas correctement cité: il y a en trop le mot *post*. Les notes à la page 30 ne font aucune mention de l'édition de Cyprien Gallus (qu'Arweiler appelle 'der Heptateuchdichter'), à savoir *CSEL* 23. Un peu étonnant est l'orthographie du nom d'Avit: on lit 'Avitus' aussi bien que

'Avit.' et le génitif 'Avits'. Mieux vaudrait d'éviter dans le texte le nom abbrévié. Dans la bibliographie, les majuscules font souvent défaut dans les titres anglais. Par exemple, le titre de l'étude de M. Lapidge n'est pas *The binding of the kosmos* (*sic*), mais *The Binding of the Cosmos* etc. Les indices aussi ont quelques défauts. Ainsi, *l'Ilias latine* n'est pas citée au p. 297 mais au p. 292.

NL-3583 AD *Utrecht*, Adr. van Ostadelaan 109 B H.G. SCHIPPER

M. Heuser and H.-J. Klimkeit, *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art*, translated by Majella Franzmann (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 46), Leiden: E.J. Brill 1998, ISBN 9004107169.

This volume of *Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies* brings together in English translation the works of two Bonn scholars, one at the beginning and one sadly at the end of a distinguished career cut short by an untimely death. The first part of the book (pp. 1-108) is an English translation of Heuser's doctoral dissertation on the main doctrinal issues (as far as a modern scholar could discern them) of Coptic Manichaean texts (especially of the [Berlin-]*Kephalaia*) and the second (pp. 111-313) is an eclectic collection of some of the most read and admired studies by Hans-Joachim Klimkeit on Eastern Manichaean texts (Middle Iranian, Turkish and Chinese). The approach of both scholars is religious-historical and not philological although both are familiar with the texts in their original languages (with the noted exception of Chinese; *vide infra*).

Mani had a habit of developing his elaborate cosmogonic teaching by endless repetition in his lectures to his disciples and students. The *Kephalaia*, the largest extant body of Manichaean didactic material, was, as W.-P. Funk had now convincingly demonstrated ('The Reconstruction of the Manichaean Kephalaia', in P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, edd., *Emerging from Darkness, Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, NHMS 43, Leiden, 1997, 151-52), put together by a major disciple of Mani, probably Adda, within one or two decades after the death of Mani. This major compilation has survived in two codices, one the *Kephalaia of the Teacher* (i.e. Mani) which is housed in Berlin and largely published, and the other the *Kephalaia of the Wisdom of my Lord Mani* which is housed in Dublin and largely unpublished. The work(s) would have reflected to a large extent the *ipsissima verba* of Mani as the compiler(s) would have had very little time to elaborate or compose fresh material for two such large collections.

Heuser's work is the first attempt to systematize the teaching of Mani, especially on cosmogony, soteriology, eschatology and numerology as found

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

in the (Berlin-)*Kephalaia*. His methodology is mainly exploratory and expository rather than interpretative but the results are obviously helpful to scholars who will otherwise have to wage through what is still a largely unindexed corpus of texts for relevant material. (For those who can read Coptic, however, there is now a Coptic Word-Index to all the fascicles of the (Berlin-)*Kephalaia* published up to 1966 by S. Clackson in *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, Vol. 1, *Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum*, Subsidia II, Turnhout, 1998, pp. 59-185, with English Index.) Heuser basically follows a classic schema in his exposition of the Manichaean myth—and it is a great misfortune that the summary provided in the *Kephalaia* by Mani himself on this score is in a highly fragmentary state (pp. 1-9)—and explores the elaborations, schematizations and contradictions throughout the published *Kephalaia* (Chapters) which are not grouped originally round specific topics by its compiler(s). Heuser's endeavour will prove vital to those who wish to know for instance what the *Kephalaia* have to tell us about such Manichaean mythological characters/symbols as 'Three Garments' or 'Three Wheels' or 'Old and New Man'—terms which are not covered in the excellent parallel work of Paul van Lindt, *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Studies in Oriental Religions, 26) Wiesbaden, 1992—so long as the readers are familiar with where these figures occur in the classic schema of the myth as the book has no subject index. A particularly useful feature of Heuser's work is a numerological listing of Manichaean cosmogonic terms which are prefaced by numerals (pp. 98-106). These abound particularly in both Kephalaic and Central Asian texts and can be confusing to both new comer and expert on Manichaean texts.

The second part of the book is a selection of some of the most original contributions by Klimkeit published over the last two decades. These cover the Manichaeans' use of Scripture; their knowledge of (other) Christian scriptures; their use of special symbols (like the Gate/Door) or of Pauline metaphors like 'Old and New Man'; their attitude to Kingship; and their attempt to assimilate with Buddhism in Central Asia. The final section consists of two articles updating Klimkeit's earlier monograph on *Manichaean Art and Calligraphy* (Leiden, 1982) and some of the accompanying plates are also better reproduced than in his earlier work. The present reviewer would like to draw particular attention to the photographs of caves containing Manichaean paintings from Sängim as these had not previously been published. Klimkeit had the benefit of access to the pioneering work of Prof. Chao Huashan which is still little known in the West.

For the readers of this journal, the most important of these articles probably will be 'Apocryphal Gospels in Central Asia' (pp. 189-211). When the standard reference book on New Testament Apocrypha by his Bonn colleague W. Schneemelcher was revised and updated, the section on Gnostic Gospels and related literature was only marginally updated by Beate Blatz. Klimkeit's article came too late for it to be utilized in the latest edition of Hennecke-Schneemelcher and, for the time being, all scholars of Early Christian texts must treat this article by Klimkeit as a missing chapter of this standard reference work. The article examines the source of Manichaean citations and/or parallels from known and unknown Apocryphal works. Klimkeit's article is particularly useful in that it draws its material extensively from Central Asian sources which indicates the extent of the influence of Syriac Christianity on Manichaean texts in Parthian. Klimkeit, however, seemed to have been unaware of the excellent work of William Petersen on the use of the Diatessarōn by the Manichaeans as Petersen's work would have almost certainly helped to broaden his approach to the citations.

We are grateful to Prof. Majella Franzmann for making available in English these important works on Manichaeism by these two German scholars. But why are many key quotations from leading German scholars and from German translations of Manichaean texts left untranslated? See e.g. pp. 12, 52, 54, 76, 77 etc. The average English-speaking university student in courses on Religious History who are the most likely users of this book will be left dumb-founded by these occasional chunks of original Teutonic scholarship.

There is one unfortunate error on p. 219, line 2. Klimkeit had followed Chavannes and Pelliot's initial French translation of the Karabalghasun inscription and gave (in Franzmann's translation): '(Virtue) led the monks and nuns and entered the kingdom . . .'. The Chinese character for virtue 'de' is the last character used in the transliterated Manichaean rank-title of Mahistag—a term which was then not known in its Chinese form to Chavannes and Pelliot although Pelliot realized this immediately upon the discovery of the first part of the Compendium from Dunhuang. So it was not 'virtue' but a 'Mahistag' who helped to convert the Uighurs. The present reviewer had communicated this correction to Prof. Klimkeit personally on many occasions but clearly he had not passed it on to his translator.

Macquarie University,
School of History, Philosophy & Politics,
Sydney NSW 2109 (Australia)

SAMUEL N.C. LIEU

Richard Goulet (éd.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Tome 3, d'Eccélos à Juvénal. Éditions CNRS: Paris 2000, 1071 pages, ISBN 2-272-05748-5, FF 560.

After an interval of six years the third volume of Richard Goulet's magnificent repertory of ancient philosophers has appeared. The first volume, from Abam(m)on to Axiothea, appeared in 1989 and was reviewed in *Vigiliae* 44 (1990) 304-308. There is no need to repeat what was said there, except perhaps to articulate that it is neither a biographical nor a bibliographical work, but rather a combination of the two, a 'bio-bibliography', and also to remind the reader of the conclusion of the review, namely that it was a project that 'excites enthusiasm'. The second volume, from Babélyca to Dyscolius, was published in 1994. The third volume now proceeds to Juvenal. It contains 483 notices, making a total of about 1500 so far. Since at the outset we were told that a record of almost 4000 philosophers has been preserved in some form or other, it may be deduced that the project has not yet quite reached the half-way mark. But even that represents a quite remarkable achievement.

The present volume has 60 contributors, prominent among whom—in terms of numbers of lemmata prepared—are Goulet himself, Tiziano Dorandi, Bruno Centrone, Bernadette Puech, Luc Brisson, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Michèle Ducos and Pierre Maraval. Mention should be made of the Spanish scholar Pedro Pablo Fuentes González, on account of the very full treatment he has given important philosophers such as Epictetus, Eratosthenes, Hecataeus, Hippocrates of Chios and Isocrates. The lemma on Heraclitus by Serge Mouraviev is also outstanding in its length and thoroughness, though also somewhat deviating in its approach. As was the case for the previous volumes, there is a certain unevenness in method and detail of coverage, but this is inevitable in a composite work of this kind.

For patristic scholars the work continues to represent an instrument of great value for at least three reasons. Firstly it contains a considerable number of informative lemmata on Christian authors who have associations with ancient philosophy. The names of Epiphanius, Eunomius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Evagrius, Hermeias, Hermogenes, Hippolytus (a particularly valuable overview of this complex dossier by Daniel Bertrand), Hosius, Isidore of Seville, Justin (and Ps.Justin) and John of Damascus are the most prominent. As may be suspected from this list, not all church fathers important for the progress of ancient philosophy have been included. It is

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

perhaps regrettable, for example, that there is no lemma on the most philosophical of the Greek patres, Gregory of Nyssa. Goulet does not commit himself on whether John Stobaeus came from a Christian background (as his name seems to imply). Secondly there are extensive surveys of the lives and works of philosophers who play a significant role in the reception of Greek philosophy in the patres, e.g. Empedocles, Epicurus, Epictetus, Galen, Heraclitus, the *Hermetica*, Hippocrates, and so on. In the long lemma on Epictetus already mentioned above the splendid recently published edition by Gerard Boter (Leiden 1999) is mentioned as an addendum, but the information it contains on the important *Nachwirkung* of the *Enchiridion* in the patristic and byzantine period could not be taken into account. Thirdly, the many lemmata on later Greek philosophers contemporary with the fathers, especially in the Neoplatonist school, such as Elias, Hierocles Himerius, Iamblichus, Isidore of Alexandria and Julian, supply a gold-mine of accurate and up-to-date information. We should also mention the importance of the index of book titles, which allows the quick identification of books on particular subjects. The placement of the numbers of the lemmata in the headings now allows an easier use of the indices. It is a pity, however, that this volume—in contrast to the previous two—does not contain any pictures of the iconographical evidence. For example, a photograph of the famous statue of Hippolytus would have certainly been a valuable addition to the lemma.

We congratulate the editor on his achievement, and wish him all the energy and perseverance that he needs in order to continue and ultimately complete his enormously valuable project.

University of Leiden DAVID T. RUNIA

Georgia Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes. Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*, The Transformation of Classical Heritage XXX, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 2000 (University of California Press), xiii + 232 pp., ISBN 0-520-22205-9, $40.00.

This is not an ordinary book about pilgrimages and pilgrims in Late Antiquity. In fact it is hardly about actual pilgrims and their journeys. It is also not a book about *loca sancta* in the Holy Land and elsewhere. This is a book about the sensual experiences pilgrims had or may have had when visiting holy places and living saints—monks, hermits, holy men—in the deserts of Egypt. In the fourth and fifth centuries visits to these holy men were an integral part of a journey to the holy sites. F. says she wrote

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

this book in order to fill the gap left behind by studies on pilgrimage that have appeared over the last decades and have deepened our knowledge about Christian pilgrimage, but which hardly discuss the matter of the pilgrim's spirituality and his or her religious sensibilities when visiting a holy man or a biblical site. The subject F. has dealt with is not an easy one. How can we know what pilgrims experienced and what they sensed when seeing a living saint or visiting a holy site? In order to answer this question, F. focuses on three aspects that were of particular importance for the spirituality of pilgrims who visited the living saints: exoticism, sensory engagement and biblical realism. By the first is meant the pilgrim's desire to become acquainted with the wonders of a distant land. The second aspect refers to the physical sense of vision and the perception of the divine; the third refers to the desire to participate in moments as described in the Scriptures. F. concentrates especially on the second aspect: the "culture of visibility", already important in non-Christian Graeco-Roman culture, and the visual access to the divine, i.e., seeing the holy as a deepening religious experience. There is also attention to tactile piety, the effect of the touch of the holy, but not as extensively as for the "eyes of faith".

Central to F.'s study are two works, both from around the year 400: *The History of the Monks in Egypt* by an anonymous Jerusalem monk, and Palladius' *Lausiac History*. These writings have almost exclusively been considered to be tales of monks and historical chronicles. However, F. prefers to see them as travelogues and as literary creations, which combined for example ancient (exotic) travel writing, saint's lives, and Bible stories; by way of their specific character they were helpful in shaping the pilgrims' perception of holy people.

After a comprehensive introductory chapter in which she puts her study into perspective and context, F. proceeds with a chapter on the above-mentioned *historiai* as travel writing. Their descriptions of miraculous and faraway regions where the saints lived and the exoticizing of the desert served to create a sense of religious displacement that made it possible for the readers of these texts to perceive and visualize monastics and saints in a spiritual way. The following chapter deals with the matter of how literary constructions like the *historiai* and other pilgrims' writings that allured pilgrims to visit holy men in the desert at the same time also shaped their perception of these holy men and functioned as a template for pilgrims to follow. In this context three common themes are discussed: the longing for face-to-face contact with the divine, the description of the desert as paradise, and the journeys of holy persons to see persons even holier than themselves. Chapters 4 and 5 are the central, most interesting and best parts of the book. Chapter 4 deals with the subject of visuality and what it meant for pilgrims to behold a holy place. By presenting a range of

examples F. makes convincingly clear how essential sight and touch of holy places and objects were for pilgrims and how these actions enabled them to enliven and experience the biblical past. Interestingly enough, this idea of sense experience was not something new for Christians but went back to earlier philosophical ideas of vision and tactile contact, especially with regard to the conception of memory. Chapter 5 "How to Read a Face" is the best, clearest in terms of argument and most successful of the book. By drawing upon the ancient ideas of the relationship between physiognomy and character, F. explains how pilgrims visualized the faces of holy men (and women) and how important for their spiritual experience of the divine it was for pilgrims to actually see the face of a saint. The old, bearded faces with sunken eyes were a living demonstration of the ascetic ideal. In these faces pilgrims could see biblical figures, like the patriarch Abraham and the prophet Moses, or angels. Through this visual experience of seeing the face of the desert saints, pilgrims were able to participate in the biblical past and deepen their spirituality; actually beholding saints' faces brought the believers closer to God. In the last chapter F. discusses briefly the experience of visualizing with regard to the Eucharist and relics. When seeing a splinter of the Cross with the eyes of faith, a believer was able to imagine the Passion and participate in it in his mind. The same is true when seeing images of the divine; F. therefore sees a continuity from the visual piety as experienced by late antique believers when seeing living saints and the cult of the icons in Byzantine times. In fact she puts forward the interesting idea that the cult of the icons was the fullest expression of the sensory piety of vision.

F.'s study does not make for easy reading. The subject is of course not an easy one, but one at times gets the impression that F. does not want to leave anything unmentioned and wants to include everything she has read (half-page footnotes are no exception). As a result it is not always facile to follow her argument; it is therefore a pity that the book does not have a clear conclusion. On the other hand, this is a study rich with ideas and one that certainly helps us to get a better idea of the sensory experiences pilgrims had when seeing the faces of living saints. It is therefore an important contribution to our understanding of late antique Christianity.

National Humanities Center
P.O. Box 12256
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709-2256, USA

Jan Willem Drijvers

THE TRUE MYSTERIES

SACRAMENTALISM IN THE *GOSPEL OF PHILIP*[1]

BY

APRIL D. DECONICK

Previous scholars of *Philip* have identified the sacraments (which they have understood to be ritual activities) as a particularly troublesome puzzle. Thus ritual in *Philip* has been the subject of numerous important and intriguing academic studies over the last generation. Each of these studies has helped steadily advance our understanding of the subject, clarifying many of the problems connected with interpreting the *Gospel of Philip*.[2]

---

[1] A rough draft of this paper was presented in 1998 to the Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group at the annual meeting of the Society for Biblical Literature. It appeared in draft form in the *SBL Seminar Papers*, Part 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 483-523 under the title, "Entering God's Presence: Sacramentalism in the Gospel of Philip." I would especially like to thank my respondents, Elaine Pagels and Charles Gieschen, for their comments and criticisms on that draft as well as the members of the Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group. In addition, my gratitude is extended to Gilles Quispel and Rachel Elior for reading earlier drafts of this article and providing me with their helpful comments.

[2] The major works include: H.M. Schencke, "'Das Evangelium nach Philippus'. Ein Evangelium der Valentinianer aus dem Funde von Nag Hammadi", *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 84 (1959) 1-26; E. Segelberg, "The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and its Sacramental System", *Numen* 7 (1960) 189-200; *idem*, "The Baptismal Rite according to some of the Coptic-Gnostic Texts of Nag-Hammadi", *Studia Patristica* 5 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962) 117-128; R. Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961) 129-140; H.-G. Gaffron, *Studien zum koptischen Philippus-Evangelium unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sakramente* (Dissertation, Rheinische-Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität at Bonn, 1969); A.H.C. van Eijk, "The Gospel of Philip and Clement of Alexandria: Gnostic and Ecclesiastical Theology on the Resurrection and the Eucharist", *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971) 94-120; M.A. Williams, "Realized Eschatology in the Gospel of Philip", *Restoration Quarterly* 3 (1971) 1-17; *idem*, "Uses of Gender Imagery in Ancient Gnostic Textes", in C. Walker Bynum, S. Harrell, and P. Richman (eds.) *Gender and Religion: On the Complexity of Symbols* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986) 196-227; J.-M. Sevrin, "Les Noces Spirituelles dans l'Évangile selon Philippe", *Le Muséon* 87 (1974) 143-193; *idem*, "Les Rites et la Gnose, d'après quelques Textes Gnostiques Coptes", in J. Ries (ed.), *Gnosticisme et Monde Hellenistique* (Louvain-La-Neuve: Universite Catholique de Louvain Institut Orientaliste, 1982) 440-450; J.E. Ménard, "'L'Evangile selon Philippe' et 'L'Exégèse de l'Âme'", J.E. Ménard (ed.) *Les Textes de*

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Yet, despite this extraordinary effort, several issues need more discussion since we have yet to come to a consensus on the number of sacraments in *Philip* let alone a "sacramental theology." Given this situation, some scholars suggest that the style of *Philip* is so allusive that we can not understand the individual actions of the specific sacraments.[3] This line of reasoning is supported in the recent article by E. Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", in *The Nag Hammadi Library After Fifty Years*, and is further evidence that scholars are still struggling to reconstruct the ritual activity alluded to in this enigmatic gospel.[4] In face of this impasse, I propose that the ritual activity in *Philip* and its sacramental theology can be reconstructed by seeing these traditions as reflective of similar traditions developing simul-

---

Nag Hammadi (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975) 56-67; J.J. Buckley, "A Cult-Mystery in the Gospel of Philip", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980) 569-581; *idem*, "'The Holy Spirit is a Double Name': Holy Spirit, Mary, and Sophia in the *Gospel of Philip*", in K. King (ed.), *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 211-227; *idem*, "Conceptual Models and Polemical Issues in the Gospel of Philip", in W. Haase and H. Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II, 25.5, 4186-4190; D.H. Tripp, "The 'Sacramental System' of the Gospel of Philip", in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica* 17, part 1 (Oxford: Pergamon, 1982) 251-260; K. Rudolph, "Response to 'The Holy Spirit is a Double Name': Holy Spirit, Mary, and Sophia in the '*Gospel of Philip*' by Jorunn Jacobsen Buckley", in K. King (ed.), *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 228-238; E. Pagels, "Adam and Eve, Christ and the Church: A Survey of Second Century Controversies Concerning Marriage," in A.H.B. Logan and A.J.M. Wedderburn (eds.), *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honour of Robert McL. Wilson* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clarke, 1983) 146-175; *idem*, "The 'Mystery of Marriage' in the *Gospel of Philip* Revisited", in B.A. Pearson, *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) 442-454; *idem*, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", in J.D. Turner and A. McGuire (eds.), *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years, Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration*, NHMS 44 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997) 280-291; M.A. McPherson Oliver, "*The Gospel of Philip* and Early Conjugal Christianity", paper delivered at Nag Hammadi Seminar, Haverford College, November 17, 1995; J. Buckley and D.J. Good, "Sacramental Language and Verbs of Generating, Creating and Begetting in the Gospel of Philip," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1997) 1-19.

Summaries of ritual activity in *Philip* also can be found in the several commentaries on this gospel: R. McL. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip* (New York and Evanston: Harper&Row, 1962); J.-E. Ménard, *L'Évangile selon Philippe. Introduction, texte, traduction, commentaire* (Paris: Letouzy & Ane, 1967); W.W. Isenberg, "The Coptic Gospel According to Philip" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1968); "Introduction", in B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7 together with XIII,2*, Brit. Lib. Or.4926(1), and P.Oxy. 1, 654, 655, Nag Hammadi Studies* 20, v. 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989) 131-139; H.-M. Schenke, *Gospel of Philip. German & Coptic. Das Philippus-Evangelium (Nag-Hammadi-Codex II,3)* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997).

[3] See especially, Williams, "Realized Eschatology", 1-17; Sevrin, "Les Noces Spirituelles", 143-193.

[4] Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", 280-291.

taneously in early Jewish mystical circles, circles which were advocating mystical ascent through the heavenly Temple and a transforming vision of God.[5]

According to the pioneering research of R. Elior, in the aftermath of the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E., Jews within these mystical circles were perpetuating Temple worship by fostering the idea of a surrogate heavenly Temple. This idea was developed largely from the visions of Ezekiel which were preserved following the destruction of the first Temple. Refusing to accept the end of their religious worship in the wake of the destruction of their cult center, they focused on the notion of a spiritual world whose cultic practices now operated on a mystical-ritual praxis. The structure of the earthly Temple was projected into the heavens as a series of three or seven *hekhalot* or shrines, *merkavot* or chariots, *devirim* or Holy of Holies.[6] The priestly and levitical traditions of Temple worship were elevated and transferred to these supernal regions in the form of angelic duties and liturgical practices. The priestly ritual was understood to be performed by the angels in the heavenly sanctuary. As the primary liturgical performers, the angels were responsible for the ceremonies associated with the priestly blessing, the use of Divine Names, the pronunication of the unutterable Name of God, the recitation of prayers, and the performance of music.[7]

The Jewish mystic could now ascend through the various *hekhalot* or shrines in order to journey to the inner sanctum and worship before God's

---

[5] Early Jewish mysticism is an esoteric tendency within Second Temple Judaism which was characterized by speculation about ascending into heaven and gaining a transforming vision of the manifestation of God. Evidence for this tendency can be seen mainly in the Philonic corpus, Jewish apocalyptic literature, the Qumran manuscripts, and the Hekhalot texts. For a fuller discussion, refer to A.D. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* 33 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996) 28-37; *idem, Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and other Ancient Christian Literature*, JSNTS 157 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) especially 47-61.

[6] Cf. the three heavens, see C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1-12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate. Part 1: The Jewish Sources", *Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993) 203-205. These are replaced by a seven-tier system. On this, refer to A.Y. Collins, "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses," in J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane (eds.), *Death, Ecstasy and Other Worldly Journeys* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995) 62-87.

[7] See R. Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and its Relation to Temple Traditions", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 4 (1997) 217-267. Cf. J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis* (Salzburg: Mueller, 1964) 133-135; C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (Atlanta, 1985); *idem*, "'He Has Established for Himself Priests'", in L. Schiffman (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 114-115.

throne.[8] He could enter the *devir*, the Holy of Holies, and gaze on God's manifestation enthroned upon the *merkavah*, the seat consisting of two cherubim with wings spread over the *kapporet*, the lid of the Ark of the Covenant (1 Chron 28:183; cf. 1 Kings 6:23-28, 8:6-7; 2 Chron 3:10-1, 5:7-8). For the human practitioner, this journey was understood to be a transformative experience. This transformation generally was described in terms of the human's transfiguration into an angel, his participation in the heavenly liturgy, or his own enthronement.[9] Often the transfiguration involved the revelation of secret knowledge about the world's operation.[10]

In the *Gospel of Philip*, we are faced with a series of three Temple shrines rather than seven: the Holy shrine, the Holy of the Holy shrine, and the Holy of the Holies shrine:

> There are three shrines (ⲏⲉⲓ)[11] for sacrifice in Jerusalem. The one opening to the west was called "the holy" (ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ). Another opening to the south was called "the holy of the holy" (ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ). The third open-

---

[8] The general concept of ascent has been the subject of several works: W. Bousset, "Die Himmelsreise der Seele", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 4* Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901) 136-169, 229-273; G. Widengren, *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 7 (Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln, 1950); C. Colpe, "Die 'Himmelsreise der Seele' ausserhalb und innerhalb der Gnosis," in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966, Numen Supplements* 12; (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967) 429-447; A. Segal, "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity, and their Environment", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.23.2 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1980) 1333-1394; U. Mann, "Geisthöhe und Seelentiefe: Die vertikale Achse der numinosen Bereiche", *Eranos* 50 (1981) 1-50; M. Smith, "Ascent to the Heavens and the Beginning of Christianity", *Eranos* 50 (1981) 403-429; I.P. Culianu, "L' 'Ascension de l'âme' dans les mystères et hors des mystères," in U. Bianchi and M.J. Vermaseren (eds.), *La Soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero romano* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982) 276-302; *idem, Psychanodia I: A Survey of the Evidence Concerning the Ascension of the Soul and Its Relevance* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983); *idem, Expériences de l'Extase* (Paris: Payot, 1984); M. Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1984); J.D. Tabor, *Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Paradise in its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts*, (Lanham: University Press of America, 1986); M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[9] For the idea of transformation, see C. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkavah Tradition", *Journal for Jewish Studies* 48 (1992) 1-31. For a ground-breaking discussion of participation in angelic liturgy, see Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines". Refer also to the earlier work by Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 29-71. For the theme of enthronement, see E. Wolfson, "Yeridah la-Merkavah: Typology of Ecstasy and Enthronement in Ancient Jewish Mysticism, in R.A. Herrera (ed.), *Mystics of the Book: Themes, Topics and Typologies* (New York: Peter Lang) 13-45.

[10] I. Gruenwald, "Knowledge and Vision: Towards a Clarification of Two 'Gnostic' Concepts in the Light of Their Alleged Origins", *Israel Oriental Studies* 3 (1973) 63-107.

[11] I translate ⲏⲉⲓ as "shrine" because this translation captures its meaning within this

ing to the east was called "the holy of the holies" (ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ), the place where only the high priest enters (69:15-21).

Philip associates these shrines with particular "sacraments:" "Baptism is 'the holy' shrine. Redemption is 'holy of the holy'. 'The holy of the holies' is the bridal chamber" (ⲡⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲏⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ [ⲡ]ⲥⲱ[ⲧ]ⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲉⲧ[ⲟⲩⲁ]ⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ) (69:22-25).[12] Also in 67:28-30 we find a passage which identifies the "sacraments" as baptism, chrism, eucharist, redemption, and bridal chamber: "The Lord [did] everything in a mystery: a baptism and a chrism, a eucharist and a redemption, and a bridal chamber" (ⲁⲡⲥⲟⲉⲓ [ⲥ ⲡ̄] ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲃⲁ[ⲡ]ⲧⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲭⲣⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣ[ⲓⲥⲧ]ⲓⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲱⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ).[13]

Clearly baptism, chrism, and the eucharist are ritual activities. But what about "redemption" and "bridal chamber?" Does ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ, or "sacrament," have to indicate a *ritual* sacrament as Segelberg and others after him have assumed? Or can it be more inclusive, describing an experience in which the human does not participate alone, but where he acts in communion with God? In a "sacrament," the human participates in a higher reality, the reality of the Spirit without ever ceasing to be human. Long ago, the Church Father John Chrysostom explained that a "sacrament" had a double meaning: "what we believe is not the same as what we see, but we see one thing and believe another."[14] The distinctive feature of a sacrament is that it is at once both "visible and invisible."[15] It is a combination of "an outward visible sign with an inward spiritual grace."[16] They

---

context better than "building" as W.W. Isenberg renders in the critical edition edited by B. Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codes II,2-7 together with XIII,2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1), and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655, Nag Hammadi Studies* 20, v. 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989) 180-181. The Coptic ⲏⲉⲓ is associated with σκηνή (temple or house), οἶκος (temple or house of god), οἴκημα (chamber, temple, or chapel), μυχός (the innermost room), and δίαιτα (room). On this refer to Crum, 66a. Cf. R. Cameron, "Ancient Myths and Modern Theories of the Gospel of Thomas and Christian Origins," *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 11 (1999) p. 242.

[12] Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*, 180.

[13] Punctuation is my own. For text and translation, see Layton and Isenberg, *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*, 176-177. In this passage, I understand swte to refer to the redeeming power of the rituals, available through participation in the Eucharist in particular, and realized or actualized in the eschatological Bridal Chamber. Thus it is not a separate ritual. Other passages in *Philip* seem to support this interpretation: 62:14, 69:23; 69:26; cf. 53:2; 53:14; 71:2-3; 85:29.

[14] *Homilies on 1 Corinthians*, 7.1 (*P.G.* 61.55).

[15] T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church: New Edition* (New York: Penguin, 1993) 274.

[16] Ware, *Orthodox*, 274.

are the means by which "God's grace is approriated to every Christian *individually*."[17] Today, according to Meyendorff, "a sacrament is a 'passage' to true life; it is man's [humanity's!] salvation."[18] A sacrament is an "*eternal* Mystery where the boundaries between heaven and earth are broken and where human decision and action acquire an eternal dimension."[19]

If we allow for this broader definition of ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ in *Philip*, then "redemption" and the "bridal chamber" might not be actual rituals, but instead holy "mysteries" which, in some way, allow the human to connect to the divine source of life. Therefore, the sacraments should be understood to include manners of thinking sacrally, mundane activities infused with sacrosanct meanings, as well as ritual performances. *Philip's* sacraments seem to have this double entrendre: a worldly meaning which is "deceptive" and an eternal meaning which is "correct" (53:24-35). Thus, I contend that it is necessary to let ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ function in this broader sense rather than the narrowly confined understanding that has permeated previous scholarship. If we allow for this broader definition, I believe that the complicated passages which refer to baptism, chrism, eucharist, redemption, bridal chamber, and marriage in *Philip* become much more sensible.

In this paper, therefore, I propose a new paradigm for interpreting the sacraments in *Philip*, a paradigm grounded in the broader definition of "sacrament." So I understand "sacraments" or the "true mysteries" to include more than ritual activities; they also identify those human thoughts and actions which have been invested with sacral meaning.

In addition, I hope to demonstrate that just as the Jewish mystics invented a surrogate supernal Temple of seven shrines through which they could ascend to the Presence of God and perform their liturgical duties, the *Gospel of Philip* preserves a similar celestial Temple tradition. Its three heavenly Temple shrines represent the esoteric reality behind the sacraments. It is plausible that these sacraments are understood on the spiritual level to represent the three rooms of the previously destroyed Temple: the *ulam* or vestibule; the *hekhal* or cental room; and the *devir* or inner sanctum. Just as each of these rooms represents a greater degree of holiness within the Temple,[20] so does each sacrament in *Philip*. Each stage in the ascent through

---

[17] Ware, *Orthodox*, 276.

[18] J. Meyendorff, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984) 20.

[19] Meyendorff, *Marriage*, 23.

[20] M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

the rooms of the heavenly Temple brings the believer closer to the *devir*, the Holy of Holies where the Presence of God dwells, seated upon his *merkavah*. As the believer moves through each Temple shrine, he is progressively transformed. For the Christian Gnostic, this ascent culminates in an eschatological experience at the much-anticipated End, when the believer finally is able to enter the Holy of Holies and gaze upon the Father, fully transformed.

1) *The Initiatory Sacramental Rituals*

The initiatory stage in the mystical-sacramental praxis is a ritual performance stage. Since this stage is the first of the three Holy shrines, it plausibly can be associated with the *ulam* or vestibule of the Temple in Jerusalem. It is quite noteworthy that before the priests were permitted to enter the Temple, they had to ritually immerse themselves (cf. Mishnah, *Tamid* 1:2, 4; 2:1; cf. *Yoma* 3:3). This immersion took place in the "sea of bronze" (1 Kg 7:23-26), a great water container supported by twelve statues of bulls (2 Chron 4:6). This basin was located to the south of the altar just outside the *ulam*.[21] This aspect is transferred to the angels in the *Hekhalot* literature where they too must bath and purify themselves in order to carry out their liturgical functions in the heavenly Temple.[22]

In *Philip*, the two initiatory rituals are performed at the same time: baptism by water and baptism by fire, which is unction or chrism (cf. 57:23-29; 67:3-9; 69:5-15). These rituals are performed for purification purposes. Baptism by water and fire operate on two levels, purifying the "visible" or physical aspect and the "hidden" or spiritual aspect: "It is through water and fire that the whole place is purified—the visible by visible, the hidden by hidden" (ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲉⲩⲧⲟⲩⲃⲟ ⲁ̄ⲡⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ ϩⲓⲡⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲡ) (57:23-25). *Philip* explains that the water and oil work to consecrate the soul and the spirit: "It is from water and fire that the soul and spirit came into being . . . the fire is the chrism" (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̣ⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲧⲯⲩⲭ̣[ⲏ] ⲙⲛ̄

---

[21] R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (translated by J. McHugh; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961) 319-320; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (translated by D. Green; London: S.P.C.K., 1966) 161; F.J. Murphy, *The Religious World of Jesus* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991) 77.

[22] Cf. P. Shäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen, 1981) paragraphs 54, 181, 184-185, 811, 814-816, 916. For discussion, refer to Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines".

ⲡⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲯⲱⲡⲉ . . . ⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲭⲣⲓⲥⲙⲁ) (67.3-6). The hidden quality of the oil is that it is the holy fire of the sacred realm "whose form is white, which is bright and beautiful, and which gives beauty" (ⲡⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ <ⲧⲉ>ⲭⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ ⲟⲩⲁⲃⲯ ⲉⲧⲟ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲥⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧϯ ⲛ̅ⲧⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲥⲁ) (67:7-9).

I suggest that the hidden quality of the oil functions to consecrate the person so that he may enter the fiery realm of heaven. It is a well-documented part of heavenly geography that a river of fire flows near the throne of the Glory.[23] The angels in Jewish texts purify themselves in the river of fire in order to prepare themselves to join in the heavenly Temple liturgy (*3 Enoch* 36; Schäfer, section 920). It appears that this heavenly geography was embedded deeply in the Valentinian tradition since it shows up in the *Extracts of Theodotus*[24] as well. In this text, there is a river of fire that runs beneath the throne. Moreover, the whole space of the Holy of Holies is fire. The veil conceals the fiery depths of the Holy of Holies from view so that no one is "destroyed by the sight of it" (Διὰ τοῦτο . . . καταπέτασμα ἔχει, ἵνα μὴ ἐκ τῆς προσόψεως ἀναλωθῇ τὰ πνεύματα). Only the archangel, the High Priest, enters the Holy of Holies. This is Jesus who was called in and enthroned. He will provide passage for the saved seed into the Pleroma only at the End (38:1-3).

The connection between the initiatory rituals and immersion in the fire of heaven may have developed in response to the fact that some traditions remembered Jesus' own baptism as an event bringing with it heavenly fire. Justin Martyr, for instance, tells Trypho that the Jordan River was blazing with fire when Jesus entered the water (πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ). When he came out of the water, he received the Holy Spirit (*Dialogue with Trypho* 88).[25] In two old Latin recensions of Matthew 3:15, there is mention that a great light shone out of the water at the moment of Jesus' baptism (It^{a}: *et cum baptizaretur, lumen ingens circumfulsit de aqua*; Vg^{ms}: *et cum baptizaretur Iesus, lumen magnum fulgebat de aqua*). According to Ephrem's *Commentary on the Diatessaron* 4.5, there was "the shining of the light upon the waters". The combined evidence has caused W.L. Petersen to con-

---

[23] For a complete list of references, refer to H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928) 60 n. 19, 112 n. 4.

[24] For critical edition, see F. Sagnard, *Les Extraits de Théodote, Sources Chrétiennes* 23 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1948).

[25] Epiphanius records that after the voice spoke from heaven, "immediately a great light shone around the place" (εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα) *Panarion* 30.13.7.

clude that this tradition is very old and was either forgotten or rejected by later Christians.[26]

In addition to their consecrating power, the initiatory rituals in *Philip* are understood to be a new birth for the believer, begetting him "through Christ in the two [*i.e.*, baptism and chrism]" (ϩITN̄ ΠΕΧC̄ ϩM̄ ΠCNAY) (69:5-7; cf. 67:13-20). This emphasis on rebirth is also highlighted in the Valentinian *Extracts of Theodotus* 78:1-2 where baptism liberates one from Fate, bringing about rebirth. This rebirth probably mirrors the spiritual birth of the aeon Jesus who had been conceived through the union of the Virgin or Holy Spirit and the Father in the Pleromic bridal chamber (*Gos.Phil.* 55:24-29; 71:4-11), since the text indicates that "we are indeed reborn through the Holy Spirit" (ЄBOλ ϩITM̄ ΠNA̅ ЄTOYAAB CЄ ⲁΠO ΜЄN M̄MO[N] N̄KЄCOΠ) (69:5).[27]

Because the text understands baptism to be regenerative (cp. John 3:3), it should not be surprising that it takes issue with the Pauline theology that through baptism the believers undergo ritual death: "Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death (ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν)? Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death (συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον)" (Rom 6:3-4a).[28] In response, *Philip* explains that "by perfecting the water of baptism, Jesus emptied it of death. Thus we go down into the water, but we do not go down into death" (N̄ΘЄ N̄TA ĪC̄ ⲁωK ЄBOλ M̄ΠMOOY M̄ΠBAΠTICMA TAЄI TЄ ΘЄ AϥΠωϩT ЄBOλ M̄ΠMOY ЄTBЄ ΠAЄI TN̄BHK ΜЄN ЄΠITN̄ ЄΠMOOY TN̄BHK ⲁЄ AN ЄΠITN̄ ЄΠMOY) (77:8-11). Rather, through the baptismal ceremonies, which included anointing with holy oil, the initiate is reborn of the Holy Spirit and then is invested with this Spirit (64:23-27).[29]

Furthermore, the investment of the Holy Spirit through the initiatory rituals is connected to the investment with the redeeming Name of God. Indeed, in *Philip* the initiate not only gains the name of Christ through

---

[26] W.L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994) 20. Cf. B.H. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[27] Concerning this notion, see now Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", 285-286.

[28] Cf. Pagels, "Ritual in the *Gospel of Philip*", 286-287.

[29] On the connection in early Christianity between unction and the reception of the Holy Spirit, see A.D. De Conick, "Stripped Before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas", *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991) 125-127.

chrism (74:12-25), becoming a "Christian", but he now is transformed into "a Christ" (ⲟⲩⲭ̅ⲣ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉ) (67:29). The name of Christ, of course, is the unutterable Name of the Father which he gave to Jesus (ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲙⲁⲩⲧⲉⲩⲟⲩⲁϥ ϩ̅ⲙ̅ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲱⲏⲣⲉ) (54:6-10). Moreover, as *Philip* indicates, Jesus "clothed himself with the Name of the Father" (ⲁϥⲧ ϩⲓⲱⲱϥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ) so that he would be transformed into the Father (54:10-11). The Christians who have been invested with this Name, know the Name but do not speak it (54:11-12). It is "the Name above all things: the name of the Father" (ϥⲥⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ) (54:7). Obviously, it is the same as referred to in Philippians 2:9, τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, which is given to Jesus: κύριος the Greek substitute for the Tetragrammaton.[30]

The investiture of the Valentinian Christian with the unutterable Name of God may have been in imitation of Jesus' own baptism and investiture with the Name since the Valentinians taught that the descent of the spirit or dove (cf. Mark 1:10) is associated with the investiture of the Name of God (cf. *Extracts of Theodotus* 22:5-6).[31] Thus, through the initiatory rituals, the believer imitates Jesus' investment with the Name at his own baptism in the Jordan.

Irenaeus alludes to this connection in his statement about the investment of the Name upon the Valentinians: "the Name which is hidden (τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον) from every deity, dominion, and power, which Jesus the Nazarene donned (ὃ ἐνεδύσατο) in the spheres of light, [the Name] of Christ" (*Adv. haer.* I.21.3). Notice, according to Irenaeus, that Jesus puts on the Name in the "spheres of light". This must denote investiture within the heavenly realm perhaps representing the supernal hidden reality behind Jesus' external baptism.

Such an allusion makes me speculate whether Jesus' investiture and that of the Valentinians as newly born Christians, should be understood within the context of priestly investiture in the heavenly Temple. This becomes plausible when we recall that in the *Gospel of Philip*, Jesus is associated with the "high priest" who will be able to enter the Holy of Holies of the heavenly Temple, bringing with him the Saved, those of the "order of the priesthood" (ⲉⲣⲱⲁ ϩ̅ⲛ̅ϩⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ϩ̅ⲛ̅ ⲧⲫⲩϫⲏ ⲛ̅ⲧⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ

[30] Refer to J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 36 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985) 95-106.

[31] G. Quispel, "Gnosticism and the New Testament", *Gnostic Studies* I (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1974) 208.

ⲛⲁⲯⲥⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲥⲁ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲧⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲩⲥ) (85:1-5).

According to Exodus 29, the consecration ceremony for the priest began by first washing him at the entrance to the Tent. Then the priest was to be invested with the priestly garb which included the turban. There is evidence that the turban was decorated with the Name of God (cf. Philo, *De vita Mos.* 2.114, 132; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.331). Furthermore, his head was anointed with oil. After these ceremonies, he could enter the holy place and perform his liturgical functions.

Similarly, the priest must be consecrated in heaven once the Temple was projected into the supernal realm in the esoteric Jewish traditions. We find a clear example of this in the *Testament of Levi* where Levi journeys through heaven in a vision. He calls the uppermost heaven the Holy of Holies in which the great Glory is enthroned (3:4; 5:1-2). The gates of the heavenly Temple are opened and he sees the Glory within. Then God gives him the blessing of the priesthood (5:1-2). Later, Levi is washed, anointed, clothed in the priestly garments and fed bread and wine (8). In the Aramaic manuscript, the angels say, "Now, see how we elevated you above all and how we gave you the anointing of eternal peace".[32]

Comparably, in *2 Enoch*, the hero Enoch ascends to the seventh heaven where God is enthroned and the angels perform the liturgy before him. Michael removes Enoch's earthly garments, anoints him with good oil, and clothes him in glorious garb (22:8). The oil is described as "greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun" (22:9-10). He is transformed into an angel (22:10-11). It is clear that this investiture and transformation is of a priestly nature, since the discussion of Enoch's progeny toward the closing of *2 Enoch* understands them to be of priestly descent (cf. *2 Enoch* 68-73).

It should be noted that the association of baptism and chrism with the priesthood and admittance to the heavenly Temple is not unknown in other early Christian literature. For instance, in the Christian-Jewish text, the *Pseudo-Clementina*, chrism is directly connected to the consecration of Aaron. It is stated that when Jesus became man, God anointed him with oil which was taken from "the wood of the tree of life." Because of this,

---

[32] H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985) 461.

Jesus is called "Christ." Moreover, Jesus now "anoints with similiar oil every one of the pious when they come to his Kingdom, for their refreshment after their labors, having overcome the difficulties of the way; so that their light may shine, and being filled with the Holy Spirit, they may be endowed with immortality" (*Recognitions* I.XLX). The author goes on to state that Aaron, the first High priest, "was anointed with a composition of chrism, which was made after the pattern of that spiritual ointment of which we have mentioned previously" (*Recognitions* I.XLVI).

This cluster of ideas must be connected to the early tradition embedded in 1 Peter 2 where the Christians are described as "being built into a spiritual house, into a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) (2:5). They are "the chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people acquired" (γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν) which has been called out of darkness into "his marvelous light' (2:9). This transformation into a Christian priesthood, according to 1 Peter, is the result of having been "born anew (ἀναγεγεννημένοι) not of perishable but of imperishable seed" (1:23). Certainly this language is reminiscent of the initiatory rituals as interpreted by *Philip*.[33]

We might note, as well, the reference in Hebrews 10:19-22 which states that Christians can enter the heavenly Temple with confidence because their hearts have been "sprinkled" clean and their "bodies washed with pure water" (λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ). Similiarly, we find a reference to the spiritual Temple in the *Epistle of Barnabas* where the author expresses his concerns about the destruction of the earthly Temple and the rebuilding of the "incorruptible" Temple. The incorruptible Temple will be built "in the name of the Lord" and "in glory." How? The author explains:

> Having received the forgiveness of sins and having placed our trust in the name of the Lord, we have become new creatures, formed again from the beginning . . . [God has] opened the doors of the Temple to us who were

[33] The notion that Jesus' own baptism in the Jordan transferred him to the priesthood serves as the basis of Christian baptism in the Syrian tradition rather than the Pauline idea of dying and rising with Christ. On this, see S.P. Brock, "The Syrian Baptismal Ordines", *Studia Liturgica* 12 (1977) 177-183. Cf. *Didascalia* 16: "As of old the priests and kings were anointed in Israel, do thou in like manner, with the imposition of the hand, anoint the head of those who receive baptism . . ."

> enslaved by death . . . By giving us repentance, [God has] introduced us into the incorruptible Temple (16).

Since the phrase, "having received the forgiveness of sins," probably indicates baptism, while "having placed our trust in the name of the Lord" must allude to chrism, we find that this text preserves a similar interpretation of these rituals: they open the doors of the spiritual Temple and allow the initiate to enter as "new creatures," bearing the image of God which was given to the human in the beginning.

It seems that *Philip* is aware of this trajectory of Christian interpretation of baptism and chrism. This gospel further develops this understanding by connecting the initiatory rituals with the language of life and resurrection. The initiate rises from the water and is anointed into the "resurrection" as *Philip* states: "it is from the olive tree that we get the chrism, and from the chrism, the resurrection" (ⲧⲃⲉⲛ̄ϫⲟⲉⲓⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ ⲡⲉⲭⲣⲉⲓⲥⲙⲁ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲧⲏⲥ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ) (73:17-19). In the same passage, *Philip* associates the oil from the olive tree with the Tree of Life in the garden of Eden (73:15-17). *Philip* stresses this connection, rebuking those who think otherwise: "Those who say they will die first and then rise are in error. If they do not first receive the resurrection while they live, when they die they will receive nothing" (ⲛⲉⲧϫ̣ⲱ ⲙ̣̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛ̣ⲁ̣ⲧ̣ⲱⲟⲩⲛ [ⲛ̄] ⲥⲉⲣ̄ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁⲥⲑⲉ ⲉⲩⲧⲙ̄ϫⲓ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ) (73:1-5). Just as Christ was resurrected, so too the initiated are resurrected through chrism (56:15-20). They are assured that upon their deaths, when they "strip off the flesh", they will enter "rest" because they have acquired "the resurrection" while in this world (ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲛϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ϣϣⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲉϫⲡⲟ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲛϣⲁⲕⲁⲁⲕⲛ ⲁϩⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲉⲥⲟⲧⲏⲥ) (66:16-20; cf. 67:13-16).

Acquiring rebirth, the Name of God, and resurrection through the baptismal and anointing ceremonies is the beginning of the initiate's tranformative experiences. *Philip* explains this initial transformation by using the analogy of God as a professional "dyer". The dyes both purify and immortalize. This purifying effect is expressed in one of *Philip's* stories: "The Lord went into the dye works of Levi. He took seventy-two different colors and threw them into the vat. He took them out all white. And he said, 'Even so has the Son of Man come [as] a dyer'" (63:25-30). Immersion also infuses the initiate with immortality. Just as good dyes "dissolve with the things dyed in them, so it is with those whom God has dyed. Since his

dyes are immortal, they become immortal by means of his colors" (ϵⲡϵⲓⲁⲏ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ ⲛϵ ⲛϵϥⲁⲱⲥϵ ⲯⲁⲩⲣ̄ ⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩ ϵⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲛ̄ⲛϵϥⲡⲁϩⲣϵ) (61:13-19). So "God baptises what he baptises in water" (ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧϵ ⲁϵ ⲣ̄ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍϵ ⲛ̄ⲛϵⲧϥⲣ̄ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍϵ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ) (61.20).

Lastly, *Philip* associates the initiatory rituals with a particular visionary experience. This association is made in 69:5-14 where it is stated that through baptism and chrism the initiate is not only begotten by the Holy Spirit and Christ, but he is joined (ϩⲱⲧⲣ) to them. This union is necessary in order for the person to gain the ability to "see" in the "light". "For this reason, it is fitting to baptize in the two, in the light [which is chrism] and the water" (ⲁⲓⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲧⲟ ⲯⲯⲉ ⲁⲣ̄ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍϵ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲛⲁⲩ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲁϵ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲭⲣⲓⲥⲙⲁ).

For *Philip* such a visionary encounter is nothing less than transformative. This belief in the transformative power of vision rests upon the ancient belief that the image enters the seer through the eye and becomes part of his soul. As we find in Achilles Tatius, *Clitophon and Leucippe*: "The pleasure which comes from vision enters by the eyes and makes its home in the breast; bearing with it ever the image . . . it impresses it upon the mirror of the soul and leaves there its image" (5:13).[34] *Philip* teaches the newly initiated about this awesome transforming power of their visionary experience: "It is not possible for anyone to see anything of the things that actually exist unless he becomes like them (ⲙⲛ̄[ⲟⲩ]ⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲗⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ ⲉⲓ ⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ) . . . You saw something of that place, and you became those things. You saw the Spirit, you became the Spirit" (ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲕⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲁⲕⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ) (61:20-23, 28-30).

Thus the baptismal and anointing ceremonies, according to *Philip*, first cleanse the initiate, allowing him access into the first of the three heavenly Temple chambers. Moreover, through this ceremony he is ritually reborn of the Holy Spirit, receiving the Name and the resurrection. As a consecrated priest and a child of the resurrection, he mystically enters the first of the sacred shrines and encounters the Holy Spirit face to face.

It is fascinating to find that this understanding of the initiatory rituals is confirmed by another Valentinian text from Nag Hammadi, the *Valentinian Exposition*. We find in this text, fragments which describe both baptism and

---

[34] I am grateful to Andrea Lieber for bringing this text to my attention.

chrism. Baptism in the water or the Jordan is for the "forgiveness of sins" which brings the human into "imperishability." When the initiate enters the Jordan, he descends into imperishability, being "[sent] out [of the world] into the Aeon." Furthermore, the descent into the Jordan is really "[the upward progression], that [is, our Exodus] from the world [into] the Aeon" (41:24-38). Another fragment relates that the descent into the Jordan is the ascent from the "[blindness] of the world [into the sight of] God." In addition, it is the ascent from the carnal into the "spiritual," from the physical state to the "angelic," from the created kosmos to the eternal Pleroma or Aeon, from slavery to "sonship." Thus, the text concludes, through baptism "we were brought [from] seminal [bodies into bodies] with a perfect form . . . And [Christ brought] us forth who are [in him, and] from now on the souls [will become] perfect spirits" (42:10-37). The next section of this paper will explore how this transformation into "perfect spirits" was believed to be fully accomplished.

2) *The Eucharist Sacrament*

The eucharist sacrament is another ritual activity referred to by *Philip*. It seems to correspond to the Holy of the Holy shrine, the shrine closely tied to "redemption" (69:23). Accordingly, this shrine is to be associated with the second room in the Temple, the *hekhal* or holy place. In the *hekhal* stood a golden altar for incense offerings (1 Kg 7:48; cf. 1 Kg 6:20-21), ten lampstands (1 Kg 7:48-49), *shulchan ha-panim* or the table of the Countenance (1 Kg 7:48-49) upon which was ritually offered *lechem ha-panim*, the bread of the Countenance. Every Sabbath twelve loaves of unleavened bread were placed on the table before the face of Yahweh (Lev 24:5-9). After a week, the loaves were eaten by the priests (Lev 6:7-9; 24:5-9).[35] There seems also to be evidence that the priests placed jugs of wine on the Table along with the loaves and then partook of beverage and bread when the time came for them to participate in the weekly meal.[36]

Andrea Lieber, in her research on feasting language and visions in Jewish mysticism, has sparked renewed interest in the cult meal and its ritual context. The holy meal seems to have represented some type of sacrifice to Yahweh. This is supported not only by Ezekiel who compares the table

---

[35] de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 319; Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 160.
[36] Haran, 216-217.

with an altar (Ezek 41:21-22), but also by Leviticus 24:5-9 where the eating of the bread by the priests is equated with the most holy offering to God. As such it was a meal offered to God (Lev 3:11, 16) and one which the priests eventually shared (Lev 24:5-9). It is plausible that, since both God and the priests partook of the bread, this sacrifice can be understood as effecting some sort of communion between Yahweh and Israel, perhaps affirming kinship between the deity and the human community. Further, the priests seem to have assimilated the sacred aspect of the bread by consuming the loaves in God's presence. By imbibing sacred bread, they incorporated the sacred within their bodies (Lev 6:7-9).[37]

According to *Philip*, the second shrine is the eucharist and "the eucharist is Jesus (ⲧⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅) . . . 'the one spread out', for Jesus came to crucifiy the world" (63:21-25). As we find in John, Jesus' body is understood to be bread from heaven which provides nourishment to those who eat it. Thus *Philip* exclaims: "When Christ the Perfect Man came, he brought bread from heaven in order that the human might be nourished with the food of Man" (ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲭ̅ⲥ̅ ⲉⲓ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛ̅ ⲧⲡⲉ ⲯⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲣ̅ⲧⲣⲉⲫⲉⲥⲑⲁⲓ ⲉⲛ̅ ⲧⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ) (55:11-14).

This action is associated with the crucifixion when Jesus was offered up to God in place of animal sacrifices. Unlike the previous sacrifical cult which offered up animals alive who then died, Jesus was offered up dead and then lived (55:1-5). Thus, Jesus' body is nourishing, life-giving. His body is living bread from heaven. And "to those who so desired, he gave [life, that] they might not die" (ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱⲯ ⲁⲩⲧ ⲛⲁⲩ [ⲛ̅ⲟⲩ]ⲱ[ⲛⲉ] ⲁⲉ[ⲕⲁⲁⲥ] ⲛ̅ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ) (73:25-27).[38] Certainly there is a connection between these ideas and the Christological title that *Philip* applies to Jesus in 85:1-5: the title High Priest.

---

[37] A.B. Lieber has developed these ideas as part of her doctoral dissertation, "God Incorporated: Feasting on the Divine Presence and the Eschatological Meal in Early Jewish Mysticism" (Columbia University, 1998). I am indebted to her for allowing me access to her unfinished manuscript. Cf. W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions* (New York: Schocken Books, 1972); J.G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy: A Treatise on Certain Early Forms of Superstition and Society*, 4 volumes (London: Macmillian, 1910); *idem, The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (New York: Macmillian, 1951); M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966); *idem, Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973); N. Jay, *Throughout Your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion and Paternity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

[38] Cp. Ignatius of Antioch, *Ephesians* 20:2, where the eucharistic elements are the "medicine of immortality". D.B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) 179-197, discusses the Greco-Roman perception of prophylaxis.

These ideas are very old since many of them are found embedded in the text of Hebrews. There, Jesus is the High Priest who has entered the Holy of Holies and offered himself up for the sins of humanity just as the previous High Priests had offered the blood of animals for the sins of the people annually in the Temple in Jerusalem (1:3-4; 2:17; 5:8-10; 6:19-20; 7:23-28;9:1-28; 10:11-14). The Christians are told to "have confidence" to "draw near to the throne of grace" (τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος) (4:16), to let their hope enter "the inner shrine room behind the curtain where Jesus has gone as a forerunner" on their behalf as the High Priest (ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος) (6:19-20). They are instructed to "offer God acceptable worship with reverence and awe; for our God is a consuming fire" (ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον) (12:28-29).

How do believers enter the Temple to worship God who dwells in the fiery depths of the Holy of Holies? In Hebrews 10:19-22, we find an answer not unlike the one *Philip* offers: through the initiatory rituals and the eucharist meal: "We have confidence to enter the Temple by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh (ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ), and since we have a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water (καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ)".

The emphasis, in Hebrews, is on partaking the body and blood of Jesus as an *atoning* sacrifice whereas in *Philip* the focus is on the consumption of a divine body as a *divinizing* mechanism. Gilles Quispel makes this distinction clear in his discussion about the differences between the Roman mass and the Greek Orthodox eucharist: "In the Roman Mass, God is a tremendous majesty, who is to be atoned by the sacrifice offered to him. The aim and purpose of the Roman Mass is atonement; of the Greek eucharist, at-one-ment."[39] Quispel explains, "The Greeks venerate in their liturgy the Unknown God beyond understanding, they venerate Christ,

---

[39] G. Quispel, "The *Asclepius*: From Hermetic Lodge in Alexandria to the Greek Eucharist and the Roman Mass," in R. van den Broek and W.J. Hanegraaff (eds.), *Gnosis and Hermeticism: From Antiquity to Modern Times* (Albany: SUNY, 1998) 70.

who in a mysterious way sacrifices and is sacrificed and whose spirit is invoked upon the faithful and upon the elements of bread and wine in order to divinize the initiates who participate in this mystery."[40] It seems that *Philip* preserves an understanding of the eucharist very close to that of the Orthodox.

Philip associates the benefits of the eucharist with the eschatological resurrection. In 56:26-57:22, the author is involved in a debate over what kind of body we will have in the resurrection. He seems to be arguing with a group of Christians who contended that they must rise in the flesh because they could not be naked before God. *Philip* responds to this, arguing that those who would rise in the body actually will be naked. He further responds by exegeting 1 Corinthians 15, stating that instead, we must unclothe ourselves so that we can be reclothed in our spiritual bodies. He maintains that the believer who partakes in the eucharist, will already have received Jesus' "flesh" as clothing in which to arise. He summarizes:

> What is this which will not inherit? This which is on us [*i.e.*, our bodies] (ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲣⲓⲱⲱⲛ). But what is this, too, which will inherit? It is that which belongs to Jesus and his blood (ⲧⲁ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲧⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲛⲟⲩ). Because of this he said, "He who shall not eat my flesh and drink my blood has not life in him" (John 6:53). What is it? His flesh is the word, and his blood is the Holy Spirit (ⲧⲉⲩⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ). He who has received these has food and he has drink and clothing (ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲣⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲟⲩ[ⲛ]ⲧⲉⲩ ⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲩ ⲥⲱ ⲣⲓ ⲏ̅ⲥ̅ⲱ) (56:33-57:9).

Philip repeatedly refers to this clothing as the "Perfect Man" (ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ), a reference to the resurrected or transformed body of Jesus. In 75:15-25, he tells us that the cup contains "wine and water", the image of Jesus' blood. This must be a reference to John 19:34 where blood and water poured out of Jesus' pierced side at the crucifixion. This cup of wine and water is "full of the Holy Spirit" (ϥⲙⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ), belonging to "the wholly Perfect Man" (ⲡⲁ ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ). When the believers drink of the cup, they will receive for themselves "the Perfect Man" (ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ). Thus the "living water", the eucharistic cup, "is a body" (ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ⲟⲩⲉⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲡⲉ). Since it is necessary for the believer to "put on the living man" (ⲱⲱⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲛ̅ⲧ ϩⲓⲱⲱⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ), he must first descend into the waters of baptism, unclothing himself, so that he might now put on the Living Man through imbibing the eucharistic body.

---

[40] Quispel, "*Asclepius*," 70.

The union of the believer with the resurrected body of Jesus has a significant soteriological purpose. The transformation into the Perfect Man has the effect of cloaking the believer from the archons during ascent.[40a] This may reflect the fact that Jesus' own movement through the heavens was undetectable to the archons who populate the realms. The *Extracts of Theodotus*, for instance, mention the fact that Jesus put on the psychic Christ whose body was invisible to the archons (59:3).

So important is this eucharistic theology, that *Philip* repeats it three times in his gospel. On the first occasion, he states: "The archons do not see those who are clothed in the perfect light, and consequently are not able to detain them." He will clothe himself in this light by uniting (ϩωτ̅ρ̅) with the Perfect Man sacramentally (70:5-10). In the second instance, *Philip* associates the garment of perfect light with the body of the Perfect Man: "Not only will they be unable to detain the Perfect Man, but they will not be able to see him, for if they see him they will detain him. There is no other way for a person to aquire this grace (ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ) except by putting on the perfect light." The one who has cloaked himself in the light will enter heaven (76:23-30). In the third case, we are told that the person must receive the perfect light while on earth because "he will not be able to receive it in the other place" (ⲉⲧⲙ̅ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲓⲧⲩ ⲉⲩⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ ⲩⲛⲁϣⲁⲓⲧⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲉⲙⲁ). He restates that the reception of the body of light provides invisibility so that the believer can not be detained during his final ascent (ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲓ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϣⲉⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲩ). And he adds that no power will be able "to torment a person like this while he dwells in this world" (86:6-11).

These ideas seem to be the basis for a passage found in another Valentinian text, the *Interpretation of Knowledge*. In this text, believers must "receive" Jesus' "shape," probably through the eucharist meal. This "shape" "exists in the presence [of the Father]." So it seems that the resurrected body of Jesus is being described. Furthermore, the shape or resurrected body is the vehicle which will allow the believer to ascend because Jesus is bearing him upon his "shoulders." Jesus commands him, "Enter through the rib whence you came and hide yourself from the beasts" or Archons (10:24-36). Clearly the believer is understood to become part of the resurrected body of Jesus,

---

[40a] Irenaeus associates the sacrament of last rites with this cloaking effect stating that certain Valentinians anointed those who were dieing so that "their inner man may ascend on high in an invisible manner." The rite made the person "incapable of being seized or seen by the principalities and powers" (Iren., *Adv.Haer.* I.21.5).

which is also described as the body of the primordial Adam. The connection with the primordial Adam should not be surprising since the first earthly man was identified in Jewish and Christian literature with the "image and likeness of God," the heavenly Man, and the *Kavod*.[41]

Thus, for the Valentinians, to receive the resurrected body, the Perfect Man, is to have one's own body transformed into the primordial body which can be resurrected but which also will be invisible to the archons. Only if one possesses the transformed body will one be able to enter the heavenly throneroom and gaze on the Father. *Philip* explains: "Do not despise the Lamb [*i.e.*, the sacrificed body], for without it, it is not possible to see the King. No one will be able to go in to the King if he is naked" (ⲘⲠⲢⲕⲁⲧⲁⲫⲣⲟⲛⲉⲓ ⲘⲠⲉⲓⲉⲓⲃ ⲁⲍⲚⲧⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲚ ⲩⲥⲟⲙ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡ<ⲣ>ⲣⲟ ⲙⲚ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲩⲧ ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲣⲣⲟ ⲉⲩⲕⲏⲕⲁⲫⲏⲩ) (58:15-17). The transformed body then is the proper covering for the ascent into the cosmic Temple and the much-anticipated vision of the Father.

Therefore, the body of the human must be transformed into the body of the Perfect Man. This occurs by incorporating the body and blood of Christ. Such ritual action has extreme consecrating and redeeming power and is to be associated with the believer's entrance into the second holy shrine of the heavenly Temple, the *hekhal*. Here, on a regular basis, just like the priests in the past, the believer approaches the table of the Presence, now the table of the eucharist, and partakes of the holy bread and wine. In so doing, he incorporates the divine body and blood of Christ into his own body. Just as the believer saw the Holy Spirit and thus became the Holy Spirit in the first shrine, *Philip* reminds the believer that here he has seen Christ and has become Christ: "It is not possible for anyone to see anything of the things that actually exist unless he becomes like them . . . You saw something of that place, and you became those things. You saw the Spirit, you became the Spirit. You saw Christ, you became Christ" (ⲁⲕⲛⲁ[ⲩ ⲁ]ⲡⲭⲥ ⲁⲕⲩⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲭⲥ) (61:20-23, 28-31).

It is noteworthy that connections between the eucharist and ascent into the heavenly Temple have been perserved in the Roman Mass and the Greek Orthodox eucharist liturgies, suggesting that *Philip* was aware of some very early Christian interpretations of this ritual. During the Roman Mass and Greek eucharist, the congregration is supposed to lift up their hearts to heaven and sing with the angels before God's throne as Isaiah

[41] Fossum, *Name*, 266-291.

heard during his throne vision (Isa 6:3), "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God." Quispel surmises that "the idea that the faithful make a heavenly journey during the Eucharist is not just simply a metaphor, but must be taken quite literally," especially in light of texts like the *Apocryphon of James* in which "the terminology of this heavenly journey ('gave thanks,' and 'we also') clearly is an allusion to the liturgy, where the hearts are lifted up during the Eucharist and man sings in harmony with the angels."[42]

3) *Marriage as a Sacrament*

Thus we approach the *devir*, the third and most holy chamber of the heavenly Temple. In the *devir*, it was believed that God's Presence dwelled. As such, his *kavod* or manifestation was enthroned upon the *merkavah* behind the veil which separates the inner sanctum from the *hekhal*. The cherubim with outstretched wings overlaid the lid of the Ark of the Covenant and formed the seat of the special throne (1 Chron 28:18; Sirarch 49:8; cf. 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kg 19:15; Isa 37:16; Ps 80:1, 99:1).[43] The goal of the Jewish mystic was to ascend through the seven *hekhalot* in order to reach the innermost shrine where the mystic would "behold the King in his beauty". The mystic's journey is also called a "descent to the chariot" or *yeridah la-merkavah*. As E. Wolfson has argued convincingly, this expression probably refers to the actual entry into the chariot, resulting in the enthronement of the mystic, his vision of the manifestation of God, and his participation in the heavenly liturgy.[44]

---

[42] Quispel, "*Asclepius*," 71.

[43] M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual", *Israel Exploration Journal* 9 (1959) 30-38, 89-94; *idem*, "The Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions", *Biblica* 50 (1960) 251-267; *idem*, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 247-259; J.-M. de Tarragen, "La Kapporet est-elle une fiction ou un élément of culte tardif?" *Revue Biblique* 88 (1981) 5-12.

[44] Wolfson, "*Yeridah la-Merkavah*", 13-45. For previous interpretations, see P. Bloch, "Die *Yorede Merkavah*, die Mysiker der Gaonenzeit, und ihr Einfluss auf die Liturgie", *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 37 (1893); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965); I. Chernus, "The Pilgrimage to the Merkavah: An Interpretation of Early Jewish Mysticism", *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6 (1987) 5; J. Dan, *Three Types of Ancient Jewish Mysticism*, The Seventh Annual Rabbi Louis Feinberg Memorial Lecture in Judaic Studies (University of Cincinnati, April 26, 1984) 34 n. 29; G. Stroumsa, review of I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, *Numen* 28 (1981) 108-109; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen, 1988) 226-227; A.F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) 322 n. 77.

In some Jewish sources the *devir* or Holy of Holies is associated with God's bridal chamber.[45] This notion is reflected in the midrashic tradition which uses the simile of the Temple as a couch or bed in order to exegete Song of Songs 3:7, "Behold, it is the couch of Solomon":

> And why was the Temple compared to a couch? Because just as this couch serves fruitfulness and multiplication (*i.e.*, sexual intercourse), so too the Temple, everything that was in it was fruitful and multiplied" (*Tanhuma Num* fol. 17).[46]

The analogy between the inner sanctum of the Temple with the bed of Yahweh may be very early since already in Ezekiel's visions the association has been made between the Holy of Holies and the womb of Yahweh's wife (16 and 23).[47]

I suppose that the association of marriage with the Holy of Holies in Jewish tradition should not be too surprising since these two are connected semantically. The sacred act of marriage in Hebrew is קידושין or *kidushin*. The verb, "to marry a couple," is לקדש or *lekadesh*. The word for "Temple," is מקדש or *mikdash* while "Holy of Holies" is קדש קדשים, *kodesh kodashim*. In addition to its marriage connotations, לקדש also means "to consecrate" and refers to anything that belongs to God. Thus the whole semantic field surrounding the concept of marriage is equal to the semantic field of the Temple and, in particular, the Holy of Holies. It seems then that the expression "Bridal Chamber" is really equivalent to the "Holy of Holies" when one understands how these words functioned in Hebrew![48]

So it should not be surprising to find that, in the *Gospel of Philip*, marriage is associated with the third shrine of the heavenly Temple, the Holy of Holies. On one level, *Philip* talks about marriage as a sacrament in terms of its human institution. On another level, it is understood to be the great eschatological event, the Bridal Chamber, when the cleansed and transformed spirit finally enters the Holy of Holies, marries his angel, and is granted to see the Father face to face. Due to the constraints of language, confusion arises since human marriage is reflective of the perfect marriage

---

[45] For a full discussion, refer to R. Patai, *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1967) 88-95, cf. 226-233.

[46] Ed. Buber, 33.

[47] For a complete discussion, see J. Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife*, SBL Dissertation Series 130 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 89-125. It may be that the veil which separated the *hekhal* from the Holy of Holies (cf. Exod 26:33; Josephus, *B.J.* V, v, 5) represented her hymen.

[48] This insight developed out of a conversation I had with Rachel Elior in 1998.

which takes place in the heavenly realm. This is expressed succinctly in 76:6-10:

> In this world the union is one of husband and wife—a case of strength complemented by weakness[49]—in the eternal realm the form of the union is different, although we refer to them by the same names (*i.e.*, marriage and bridal chamber) (ⲉⲡϩⲱⲧⲣ̄ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ϩⲓ ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧϭⲱⲃ ϩⲙ ⲡⲁⲓⲱⲛ ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϩⲱⲧⲣ̄ ⲉⲙⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲣⲁⲛ).

This means that for *Philip* marriage was a sacrament on two levels: in the way it was lived during the earthly experience of the couple; and as an end-of-the-world event when the angelic marriages took place in the Pleroma, the Holy of Holies or the Bridal Chamber.

a. *Human Marriage*

One of the most telling passages in *Philip* regarding human marriage is found in 64:31-32: "Great is the mystery of marriage! For [without] it the world would [not exist]" ([ⲡⲙ]ⲩ̣ⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲅⲁⲙ[ⲟⲥ] ⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ [ⲡⲉ ⲁϫⲛ̄]ⲧ̣ϥ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉ ⲡⲕⲟⲥ[ⲙⲟ]ⲥ̣ ⲛⲁϣⲱ[ⲡⲉ ⲁⲛ]). Here, human marriage is associated with procreation. Furthermore, the marital union that *Philip* demands for his followers differs from the normal marital practices of non-Valentinians. *Philip* demands that the perfect human marital union be one controlled by pure thought rather than one controlled by sexual desire. Thus *Philip* refers to the former as "marriage of purity" (ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧϫⲱϩⲙ) (82:5) while the latter is "marriage of impurity" (ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲱϩⲙ) (64:36-37; 82:5).

In sacramental human marriage, known in *Philip* as the "marriage of purity," during sexual intercourse, the thoughts of the couple must not be adulterous, focusing on another lover. For if this were the case, the child conceived would resemble the lover rather than the spouse: "The children a woman bears resembles the man who loves her" (78:14). Nor must the couple's thoughts be focused on the world. For then the child who is born will resemble the world (78:20-25). What *Philip* proposes is that the couple direct their thoughts to God so that the child conceived will be of the spiritual race resembling the Lord:

> Now you who live together with the son of God, love not the world, but love the Lord, in order that those you will bring forth may not resemble the world,

[49] Text is corrupt, thus emended by Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II,7*, 194: ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧϭⲱⲃ.

> but may resemble the Lord (ⲚⲦⲱⲧⲚ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲯⲟⲟⲡ ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲯⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲚ̄ⲙⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙ̄ⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ⲡⲍⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲯⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲍⲡⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲍⲟⲉⲓⲥ) (78:20-25).

Because the partners have united with God in their thoughts and love, they draw the heavenly spirit or light down to rest upon their own spirits, thus conceiving children of the Spirit:

> Spirit mingles with spirit, and thought consorts with thought, and [light] shares [with light] (ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲉⲯⲁ[ⲣⲉ] ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲧⲱⲣ ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲗⲟ[ⲩⲟⲥ] ⲯⲁϥⲣ̄ⲕ[ⲟ]ⲓⲛⲱ[ⲛ]ⲉⲓ ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲗⲟⲩⲟⲥ [ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲟ]ⲩⲟ[ⲉⲓⲛ ⲯⲁ]ϥⲣ̄ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲉⲓ [ⲙⲚ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ]) . . . If you become [a spirit], it is the spirit which will be joined to you (ⲉⲕⲯⲁⲯⲱⲡⲉ [ⲙ̄ ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄] ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲱⲧⲣ̄ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ). If you become thought, it is thought which will mingle with you (ⲉⲕ[ⲯⲁⲛⲯ]ⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲗⲟⲩⲟⲥ ⲡⲗⲟⲩⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲱϩ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲕ). If you become light, it is the light which will share with you (ⲉ[ⲕ]ⲯⲁⲛⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲕⲟⲓⲛⲱⲛⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲕ). If you become one of those who belong above, it is those who belong above who will rest upon you (ⲉⲕⲯⲁⲛⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁ ⲛϩⲣⲉ ⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁ ⲛϩⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈) (78:29-79:5).

It is noteworthy that this section of *Philip* is immediately preceded by a passage which seems to be familiar with the *Song of Solomon*: "Spiritual love (ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙ[ⲁⲧⲓⲕⲏ]) is wine and fragrance" (77:35-36). Compare this with the *Song of Solomon* 1:2-3, "For your love is better than wine, your anointing oils are fragrant", and 4:10, "How sweet is your love, my sister, my bride! How much better is your love than wine, and the fragrance of your oils than any spice!" It may be that *Philip's* understanding of the marriage of purity which is to be governed by contemplation of the Lord may be one of the earliest Christian exegeses of the *Song of Solomon.*

At any rate, the mystical aspect of marriage according to *Philip* also is referred to in 81:30-82:26. In this passage, *Philip* states that sexual intercourse between married partners is done "in private" (ϩⲚ̄ ϩⲩⲡⲉⲑⲏⲡ) in order to beget children. He says that the private procreative moment is a "mystery" (ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ) for every ordinary married couple. If procreation within the ordinary marriage of impurity is a mystery, *Philip* declares how much more mysterious is conception between partners of pure thought: "If there is a hidden quality to the marriage of impurity, how much more is the marriage of purity a true mystery!" (ⲉⲯⲍⲉ ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲍⲱϩⲙ ϥϩⲏⲡ ⲡⲟⲥⲱ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲡⲅⲁⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲍⲱϩⲙ ⲟⲩⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲛⲟⲛ) (82:4-6). The proper marriage is the marriage that is based on "pure" (ⲧⲃⲃⲏⲩ) thought rather than mere "carnal" (ⲥⲁⲣⲕⲓⲕⲟⲛ) activity, "belonging not to desire, but to the will" (ⲉϥⲏⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲧⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲱⲯ) (82:9). During sexual intercourse, the couple must send their will to heaven.

In so doing, they will draw down the light and at the mysterious moment of conception, the light will consort with the couple. Thus *Philip* states regarding this moment: "It belongs not to the darkness or the night but to the day and the light" (82:9-10). So sacred is this private mystical moment between the partners when heaven's own descends and mingles with them, that *Philip* declares sexual relations which are not conducted in private, to be "prostitution" (ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲓⲁ) (82:9-10).

Thus *Philip* explains that those who partake of the marriage of purity conceive "from the grace" (ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ) which is within their spouses (59:5-6). Associated with this is the emphasis in *Philip* on kissing between the perfect partners. Because they have been nourished with the body of the Perfect Man by partaking of the eucharistic elements, when they kiss each other, they conceive and give birth to perfect children (59:1-4). Even Jesus seems to be engaged in kissing activity with Mary Magdalene (63:35-36). The idea that life or the spirit could be transferred or exchanged by a kiss is a very old idea and probably underlies this particular behavior and interpretation.[50] It was through the kiss, *Philip* seems to say, that the perfect spirit of the child is conceived while the body through sexual intercourse itself. Thus marriage and conception involve physical activities as well as a mystical consciousness which invites the divine light to mingle with the couple in order that they may conceive a child of the spiritual race.

Of course, this ideology of marriage and sexual activity must be what Ireneaus is objecting to when he claims that the Valentinians believe themselves "to be perfect," "the elect seed" because they possess "grace" which has "descended from above by means of unspeakable and indescribable intercourse" (αὐτοὺς δὲ ἰδιόκητον ἄνωθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρρήτου καὶ ἀνονομάστου συζυγίας κατεληλυθυῖαν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν). Thus the Valentinians maintain that "in every way it is always necessary for them to practice the mystery of intercourse (διὸ καὶ ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου δεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀεὶ τὸ τῆς συζυγίας μελετᾶν μυστήριον)." But for the non-elect, sexual intercourse is dangerous because it is not performed as a sacramental union but as an expression of sexual desire. Irenaeus quotes them as saying, "Whosoever being *in* this world does not so love a woman as to obtain possession of her (ὃς ἂν ἐν

---

[50] Cf. Gen 2:7; Jn 20:22; 1 Cor 16:20; OdesSol 28:6-7; Xenophon of Ephesus 1.9.6. See I. Löw, "Der Kuss", *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 65 (1921) 253-276, 323-349; K. Thraede, "Ursprünge und Formen des 'Heiligen Kusses' in frühen Christentum", *JAC* 11-12 (1968-1969) 124-180; G. Stählin, "φιλεω etc.", *TDNT* 9, 113-171.

κόσμῳ γενόμενος γυναῖκα οὐκ ἐφίλησεν, ὥστε αὐτῇ κραθῆναι), is not of the truth, nor shall attain to the truth. But whosoever being *of* the world (ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ κόσμου ὤν) has intercourse (κεράννυμι) with a woman, shall not attain to the truth, because intercourse with his wife resulted from desire (διὰ τὸ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ κραθῆναι γυναικί)." Those *in* the world but not *of* the world are the Valentinians who will attain to the Pleroma. They are expected to be involved in sacramental sexual practices as married couples. The psychics or ordinary Christians, however, are *of* the world. In order to attain to the "intermediate habitation" or the dwelling place of the Lower Sophia, they must practice "continence and good works (ἐγκράτειαν καὶ ἀγαθὴν πρᾶξιν)" (*Adv. haer.* 1.6.4). If they are sexually active, even during their marriages, they are involved in impurity and sin because their minds are focused on fulfilling the pleasures of their bodies rather than the will of their spirits.

Philip's understanding about the esoteric nature of sexual intercourse is very similar to that espoused by the Hermetics. According to both the Latin and the Coptic fragments of *Asclepius*,[51] intercourse is a great "mystery" (*mysterium*; ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ) (Latin *Asc.* 21; *NHC* 65:15-66:24) which reflects God's own creative potency. *Asclepius* 21 insists that "the mystery of intercourse" must be performed "in secret" (*effectus itaque huius tam blandi necessariique mysterii in occulto perpetratur*; ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϩⲱⲡ) so that the couple may not be disgraced in front of those who do not themselves partake in the esoteric reality of the sexual experience.

The esoteric reality of the sexual encounter is one that only the pious understand and perform. To the impious, the "holy mysteries" of incourse are "laughable and unbelievable". The pious direct their thoughts to the contemplation of their true divine selves so that the divine selves are able to mingle with the other, having arisen in both natures from the sexual coupling (Latin *Asc.* 21: *inperitis utriusque naturae divinitas ex commixtione sexus cogatur erubescere*). Unlike the pious, the impious focus on their passions which are an "incurable sore" gnawing at the soul. During intercourse, harmful desire dwells within the impious and blocks them from rising above pure matter (Coptic *Asc.* 67:9-20). Those, however, who listen to God imitate him by restraining their passions. Like the androgynous Father who "crafted

---

[51] For Latin, see A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* 2 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945) 259-401; for Coptic fragments, see D.M. Parrott, *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4, Nag Hammadi Studies 11* (edited and translated by P.A. Dirkse and D.M. Parrott; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979) 395-452.

all things by his own will" (*C.H.* V.7),[52] their thoughts and actions must be controlled by their own will (Coptic *Asc.* 67:25-28).

It seems that the Hermetics extended their ideas of self-contemplation to sexual activity, turning a generally carnal activity into the supreme meditative moment when the divine Mind within each sexual partner unites with the other. Thus, the Hermetics claim that the begetting of children is "a duty in life to be taken most seriously and greatly revered". Furthermore, "should any human being pass away childless", they suffer "the worst misfortune and irreverence". Accordingly, "after death such a person suffers retribution from demons" (διὸ καὶ μεγίστη ἐν τῷ βίῳ σπουδὴ καὶ εὐσεβεστάτη τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσίν ἐστιν ἡ παιδοποιία, καὶ μέγιστον ἀτύχημα καὶ ἀσέβημά ἐστιν ἄτεκνόν τινα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπαλλαγῆναι, καὶ δίκην οὗτος δίδωσι μετὰ θάνατον τοῖς δαίμοσιν) (*C.H.* II.17). Is it possible that the Hermetics understood this reverent coupling to produce children filled with Mind, while the coupling of those who do not rise above the carnal pleasures of intercourse, was responsible for propagating those the Hermetics called "the souls of men devoid of Mind" (*C.H.* IV.3), mere fodder for death (*C.H.* I.18)?

This understanding of sexuality may help us to make sense of a difficult passage in *Corpus Hermeticum* I.18, a passage which has usually been interpreted by scholars as an example of a text advocating sexual asceticism: "let he who has Mind in him recognize that he is immortal, that *eros* is the cause of death" (ἀναγνωρισάτω <ὁ> ἔννους ἑαυτὸν ὄντα ἀθάνατον, καὶ τὸν αἴτιον τοῦ θανάτου ἔρωτα). Outside of its context, this passage smacks of sexual renunciation. But when viewed within its context, this interpretation becomes problematic:

> God immediately spoke a *holy* speech: "Increase in increasing and multiply in multitude, all you creatures and craftworks, and let he who has Mind in him recognize that he is immortal, that *eros* is the cause of death, and let him recognize all that exists". After God said this, Providence, through fate and through the cosmic framework, caused acts of intercourse and set in train acts of birth; and all things were multiplied according to kind. The one who recognized himself attained the chosen Good, but the one who loved the body that came from the error of desire goes on in darkness, wandering, suffering sensibly the effects of death (*C.H.* 18-19).

It seems that sexual activity itself is not the problem according to this passage, but sexual intercourse focused on *eros* or carnal desire. The one who

---

[52] See A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum* I (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945).

directs his thoughts inward and contemplates his divine self, has risen to God and partakes in the esoteric reality of intercourse. Unfortunately, the Hermetics state that most people do not do this while having sex. They are led astray by their desire because they have focused their love on their bodies rather than their divine selves. In this way, they can not rise to the heavens during intercourse and, uniting with the divine, perpetuate immortality. Rather, they continue to wander around the darkness of the sense world, and through their ignorance will perpetuate death.

According to the Gospel of Philip, there are further advantages to the pure marriage. If the married couple have drawn down the spirit or light to consort with them during sexual relations, both are protected from the unwanton advances of evil spirits which would otherwise be free to fondle and defile them (65:3-26).[53] One receives this spiritual spouse from the marriage of purity which is called here, "the mirrored bridal chamber" (ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣⲓⲕⲟⲛⲓⲕⲟⲥ) (65:13) since it imitiates the future marriage that will occur in the eschatological bridal chamber between the person's spirit and his angel. Thus the descent of the spirit or light is also referred to by *Philip* as the descent of an angel. If the partners unite their thoughts and love with God, the angel descends into their midst and unites with them during sexual intercourse (cf. 65:24-26).

According to *Philip*, this type of marriage is supposed to imitate the hierogamy of the Father and the Virgin Spirit who, in the great bridal chamber, conceived Jesus in order to reflect the pristine harmony of the pleroma (71:5-10). The conception was a fiery event in which the spiritual body of the aeon Jesus was begotten (71:6-9). He left the bridal chamber "as one who came into being from the bridegroom and the bride" (71:10-11).

Now such a union is to be enacted by human activity because its imitation helps to reestablish the harmony within the pleroma, a harmony which was lost when Sophia conceived outside the boundaries of marriage. This lost harmony was perpetuated after the creation of Adam and Eve when Eve followed Sophia's example and separated from Adam, having sex with him outside of marriage. So "Eve separated from Adam because it was not in the bridal chamber that she united with him" (70:22-23).[54]

---

[53] This is an old idea reflected in Genesis 6 and 1 Corinthians 11.

[54] The notion that Adam and Eve had sex outside of marriage may be connected to the popular belief that they had sex before they had reached adulthood; cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3,22,4; *Demonstratio* ch. 12; Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* 2,25; Clement of Alexandria, *Prot.* 11,111,1.

Philip teaches that Jesus came to reestablish the lost harmony by restoring marriage and conception to its proper form. This was accomplished through Jesus' own conception and birth. Because Jesus' earthly conception and birth imitated the conception and birth of his aeonic body, the proper form of marriage finally was brought to earth, a marriage which mirrored the great hierogamy: "Christ, therefore, was born from a virgin to rectify the fall which occurred in the beginning" (71:19-21). Jesus came "to repair the separation which was from the beginning" by bringing, through his own birth, the divine bridal chamber to earth. Now those who imitate this divine union in their marriages "will no longer be separated" (ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲱⲧⲡ̄ ⲇⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲡⲁⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲕⲉⲧⲓ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲡⲱⲣⲥ) (70:20-21). The believers, by following the example of the divine marriage, will enter rest, reestablising the lost harmony of the pleromic world (70:10-22; 71:12-15; cf. 68:22-26).

It is fascinating how similiar ideas develop in the later Jewish mystical traditions where sexual imagery particularly becomes connected to the act of God's enthronement upon the cherubim seat in the Holy of Holies. In *Hekhalot Rabbati*, God's enthronement takes the form of a sacred marriage. Thus the mystic must recite when he enters the *merkavah*:

> Gladden the King who [sits] upon you [the throne], as the joy of the bridegroom in his bridal chamber (חשמח מלך שעליך כשמחת חתן בביתו חופתו).[55]

God's "embellishment is more exquisite than the embellishment of the bridegroom and bride in the house of their wedding" (חתנים וכלות בביתו חופתם).[56] Moreover, the faces of the angels are compared to "the appearance of the bride" (אפיהון כחיזו דכלא).[57] Therefore, God commands those mystics who have entered the *merkavah*:

> Bear witness to them of the testimony you see in me regarding what I do to the visage of Jacob, your father, which is engraved upon my throne of glory, for when you say before me, Holy, I bend down over it (literally: her), clasp it, embrace it, and kiss it, (קדוש כורע אני עליה ומנפף אותה ומחבק אותה ומנשק אותה) and my hands are on its arms, thrice daily, for you say before me, Holy, as it says, "Holy, holy, holy".[58]

---

[55] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 94. Cf. paragraphs 154 and 687; *idem*, *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, 105 and 185.

[56] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 159.

[57] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 353.

[58] Schäfer, *Synopse*, paragraph 164.

The sexual nature of the enthronement is alluded to in the Talmudic tradition as well, where emphasis is placed on the two cherubim between which the Shekhinah rests:[59]

> When Israel used to make the pilgrimage, they (*i.e.*, the priests) would roll up for them the veil and show them the cherubim which were intertwined with one another, and say to them: "Behold! Your love before God is like the love of the male and female" (*b. Yoma* 54a).

Such passages have caused E. Wolfson to treat the enthronement of God's manifestation as "a metaphor for a sacred union of the masculine and feminine aspects of the divine".[60]

Ingeniously, M. Idel connects this imagery with the talmudic dictum: "If a man and woman are worthwhile, the divine Presence dwells between them, if not—they shall be consumed by fire" (*b. Sotah* 17.a).[61] Idel suggests that this dictum should be interpreted as pertaining to sexual intercourse between married partners, an act whose performance, according to some Jewish traditions, affected the appearance of the Shekhinah on earth. Not only was the Shekhinah believed to be present during intercourse,[62] but if the union produced children, the Shekhinah would continue to dwell on earth.[63] Thus, according to Idel, this dictum suggests that "perfect sexual union influences the Divine Presence, causing it to dwell with the worthy pair".[64] Idel concludes that after the destruction of the Temple, the role of the cherubim as performers of the sacred union with God was transferred to human partners, thus partially perserving the sacred union by human activity.[65] The pure union of male and female in marriage restored the Shekhinah to her place on earth among the Jews, reestablishing the harmony that had originally existed in the Temple.[66]

In Kabbalistic traditions, it was believed that each person had an astral body which was linked to the image of God in which the human was created. Rabbi Eleazar of Worms says:

---

[59] Cf. *Midrash Tadshe*, Jellinek, *Beth Hamidrash* iii, 167.

[60] E. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 101.

[61] Cf. *Pirke de-R. Eliezer*, ch. 12, and *R. Tuviah ben Eliezer's Lekah Tov on Genesis*, 2:23.

[62] Cf. *Bereshit Rabba* 8,9 (p. 63); 22,2 (p. 206).

[63] Cf. *Yevamot* 63b-64a.

[64] M. Idel, "Sexual Metaphors and Praxis in the Kabbalah", in D. Kraemer (ed.), *The Jewish Family: Metaphor and Memory* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) 201-202.

[65] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 203.

[66] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 204.

> Each person has his form above, who is his advocate . . . an angel who guides that person's "star." And when he is sent below, he has the image of that person who is beneath him . . . And this is, "and God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him" [Genesis 1:27]. Why twice, "in his image/in the image of"? One is the image of man, and one is the image of the angelic being, who is in the form of that man (*Hokhmath ha-Nefesh* [Lemberg, 1876] 117-118).

This angel was understood to be the person's divine double which was imprinted on him at the moment of conception.

In the Zohar, the personal angel is understood to be a preexistent primordial shape or garment that the soul wears prior to entering the body. The Zohar says:

> When a man begins to consecrate himself before sex with his wife with a sacred intention, a holy spirit is aroused above him, composed of both male and female. And the Holy One, Blessed Be He, directs an emissary who is in charge of the human embryos, and assigns to him this particular spirit, and indicates to him the place to which it should be entrusted. . . . Then the spirit descends together with the image, the one in whose likeness [the spirit] existed above. With this image, man grows; with this image he moves through the world (III,43a-b).

Again in the Zohar it is stated, "at the moment of sex, the Holy One, Blessed Be He, sends a likeness that has the physiognomy of the person who is about to be formed imprinted and etched upon this image, and it stands over the act of intercourse. And were the eye allowed to see, he would observe above his head an image formed like the physiognomy of that person, and in that same image man is created (III, 104b)."

Thus, according to Idel, the later Kabbalists had developed this ancient idea of sacral marriage. They stated that when the husband and wife have intercourse, the husband's thought must "unite with the supernal entities" because his thought will draw "the supernal light downward". Then the light will rest upon the semen.[67] The goal of intercourse is procreation in cooperation with the Shekhinah by having sex with a mystical consciousness united with God. The union of the parent's human bodies produces the child's body, while the soul emerges from the spiritual realm through the union of pure thought with God.

According to Idel, in the Kabbalistic tradition, marriage and sex are "transformed into a mystery . . . whose success is crucial for both the divine

---

[67] Chavel, *Kitve ha-Ramban*, II,373.

cosmos and the lower universe".[68] Pure sexual relations were understood as participating mystically in the divine hierogamy by imitating it and influencing the harmony of the upper world.[69]

It seems that the idea of sacramental marriage was not uncommon in Jewish, Valentinian traditions and even Hermetic traditions. The notion seems to be based on an ancient view of sexuality—that it was more than a physical activity with physical consequences. The thoughts of the sexual partners either raised intercourse to a sacred height or drew it down to the depths of sin. When performed sacramentally, the spirit of the child conceived would resemble God. Being immortal, it would be drawn down from the heavens above to sojourn on earth until it returned to its spiritual origin at death. But when performed out of desire, the child would merely resemble the world and its darkness and become fodder for death.

b. *The Eschatological Bridal Chamber*

The great day of complete "restoration" (ⲁⲡⲟⲕⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ) when the spirit of the person finally will enter the bridal chamber and marry his angel (67:16-20) will take place at the end of the world. Until that time, the bridal chamber, the Holy of Holies, remains hidden behind the veil (84:20-26). At the Eschaton, however, the veil will be rent "from top to bottom" (85:10) and the interior of the Holy of Holies will be revealed (84:25-26).[70] The world will be left desolate and the Demiurge will flee the cosmos. He, however, will not be able to flee into the heavenly Temple shrines because he "will not be able to mix with the unmixed [light] and the [flawless] pleroma" (84:27-34).

In contrast, the believers who "belong to the order of the priesthood" because they have prepared themselves sacramentally for entry into the Temple, will "go within the veil" led by Jesus "the High Priest" (ⲉⲣⲱⲁ ⲫⲛ̄ⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲫⲛ̄ ⲧⲫⲩⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲱⲥⲛ̄ ⲥⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲫⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲫⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲧⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲩⲥ) (85:3-5). The Ark of the Covenant is "their salvation" since they find themselves under "the wings of the Cross" (ⲥⲛⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲫⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲫ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲣⲟⲥ [ⲁⲩⲱ ⲫⲁ ⲛ]ⲉⲩⲥⲃⲟⲉⲓ ⲧⲉⲉⲓⲥⲓⲃⲱⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲱⲱ[ⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟ]ⲩⲟⲩⲍⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉ ⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲕⲗⲩⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲙⲁⲫⲧⲉ ⲉⲫⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲍⲱⲟⲩ) (84:33-35). This state-

[68] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 208.

[69] Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 210.

[70] Exegesis of Hebrews 9:1-10 seems to have contributed to the development of this description of the end of the world.

ment seems to reflect the Jewish tradition of the mystic's entry into the Holy of the Holies and his enthronement between the winged cherubim which overlaid the lid of the Ark. Thus since they are seated under the wings of the Cross upon the *kapporet* it can be understood that they have been enthroned and transformed. Now the secrets of the heavenly world can be revealed to them (85:18-20). The rending of the veil reveals the Holy of the Holies and they are invited into the bridal chamber (85:20-21).

Just as the light was drawn down to earth by the pure thoughts of the married partners, now in the heavenly bridal chamber "the perfect light will flow out to everyone". As children of the bridal chamber, they enter the Holy of Holies and permanently receive the light which is essential for their union (86.5). In so doing, they join in marriage with their angels, their alter egos or spiritual twins.[71] But for now, while on earth, this could only remain a great hope hidden until the end of the ages.

This eschatological hope, however, is foreshadowed in a saying that seems to have been part of the liturgical words spoken at their eucharist meal.

> He said on that day in the eucharist [ceremony] (ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁ): "You have joined the perfect light with the Holy Spirit; also unite the angels with us, we ourselves as the images" (ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϩϩⲱⲧ̄ⲣ ⲁ̄ⲡⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲡⲓⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ϩⲟⲧ̄ⲣ ⲛ̄ⲁⲥⲧⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϩⲱⲱⲛ ⲁ ⲛϩⲓⲕⲱⲛ) (58:10-15).

It may be that these particular words were part of a eucharist ritual meal which was performed during the marriage ceremony as it was performed in ancient Orthodox tradition and as it remains today in Roman Catholic tradition. During the wedding as recorded by *Philip*, the couple may have partaken of the elements, enjoining their angels to unite with them in holy matrimony. This, of course, supports the statement in 65.1-26, which explains that each marriage partner must receive his angelic power during the wedding, the "mirrored bridal chamber," in order to ward off lecherous demons. This means that the marriage itself was not a ritual, but was believed to be a "mystery" in the sense that it was a sacral union of two humans and their angels, especially during sexual activity. If any ritual was performed during the actual wedding, it probably was the eucharist which was perhaps followed by the act of consummation in the bridal

---

[71] Cp. Clement of Alexandria, *Extracts of Theodotus*, 21:1, 53:3; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 1.7.1, 1.13.6).

room (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.21.3). In this way, the human marriage of the couple was understood to be a sacramental union anticipating the eschatological marriage in the great Bridal Chamber.

It seems then that the sacramental experiences allowed the believer to mystically penetrate the heavenly Temple as far as the veil of the Holy of Holies. Through the sacraments of initiation and the eucharist meals, the believer gazed upon the Spirit and was transformed into the Spirit, beheld the Christ and was transfigured into Christ. Moreover, by enacting the sacred marriage through properly directed sexual activity, the believer participated mystically in the hierogamy taking place behind the veil and thus influenced the harmony of the divine world. *Philip* reminds the believer that at this third stage, the human is enacting the divine marriage, and in so doing: "You saw the Father" (ⲁⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲡ[ⲉⲓⲱⲧ]) (61:31). But complete transformation into the Father must wait until the Eschaton when "you shall become Father" ([ⲕ]ⲛⲁⲯⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲧ) (61:31). In that divine bridal chamber, the believer will see his angelic self, "and what you see you shall [become]" (ⲡⲉⲧⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲯ[ⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙ]ⲟϥ) (61:32-35).

Similarly, according to the *Extracts of Theodotus*, on the Lord's Day, the believers which have been purified and have passed into the second room of the heavenly Temple where they have discarded their soul bodies, are transformed into their pure spiritual bodies. Together with their angelic bridegrooms, they cross the threshold, passing into "the bridal chamber" (τοὺς νυμφίους). They "attain to the vision of the Father" (πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ὄψιν ἔρχονται), now "having become intellectual aeons, in the intellectual and eternal marriages of the Syzyge" (Αἰῶνες νοεροὶ γενόμενα, εἰς τοὺς νοεροὺς καὶ αἰωνίους γάμους τῆς συζυγίας) (64:1-65:1).

4. *Redemption*

"Redemption (ⲥⲱⲧⲉ)" is also called a "sacrament" in the *Gospel of Philip* (67:28-30; cf. 69:25-26; *Tripartite Tractate* 127:25) and is mentioned in the writings of the Church Fathers (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.13.6, 1.21.1-5; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 4.41). But, like marriage, I believe that it should not be understood as a ritual event. Rather it is the "mystery" of "being redeemed" by God, of entering the heavenly Temple (cf. 69:24-25).

Therefore, in *Philip*, it is associated with the standard ritual events. It is connected with baptism (69:25-26): "Baptism possesses the resurrection and the redemption (ⲡ[ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓ]ⲥⲙⲁ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥ[ⲓⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡ]

ⲥⲱⲧⲉ." In 62:15-17, it is associated with the eucharist, the "measuring" of Jesus. Thus: "'Jesus' in Hebrew is 'the redemption' (ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲙ̅ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧϩⲉⲃⲣⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲥⲱⲡⲉ) . . . It is 'the Nazarene' and 'Jesus' who have been measured." This interpretation is particularly inviting when one recalls that according to 63:22-25, the name "Jesus" is also identified with the eucharist: "The eucharist is Jesus (ⲧⲉⲩⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅). For he is called in Syriac 'Pharisatha,' which is 'the one who is spread out,' for Jesus came to crucify the world." And finally "redemption" is associated with the eschatological Bridal Chamber (69:25-26): "As regards the redemption, it is in the Bridal Chamber (ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲉ ϩ̅ⲙ̅ ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ)." At the end of the world, those who have entered the Bridal Chamber and its perfect light will receive the real chrism, not just the earthly type or image of it as they had formerly when on earth. This will "redeem (ⲥⲱⲧⲉ)" the "captives." Only then will they be able to marry their betrothed angels.

What I conclude from this is that, for the Valentinians who wrote *Philip*, there was an important esoteric distinction between their ritual performances and the performances of ordinary Christians: that is, the rituals performed by the Valentinians effected a deeper spiritual action than those performed by other Christians because the Valentinians believed that their rituals actually "redeemed" the person. This conclusion is supported by the evidence given to us by Irenaeus. He admits being confused about how the Valentinians understood "redemption" because they associated it with each of the different rituals. Irenaeus sorts this out by stating that some Valentinians associate redemption with baptism: the pneumatics automatically are redeemed when they are baptized, while the ordinary Christians, the psychics, receive only the remission from their sins when they are baptized (*Adv. haer.* 1.21.2-3). Other Valentinians connect redemption with chrism (1.21.4) or the anointing rites preceding death (1.21.5) so that "their inner man may ascend on high in an invisible manner as if their body were left among the created things in the world, while their soul is sent forward to the Demiurge." Still others claim that redemption was achieved through their sacramental unions in marriage (1.21.3). And finally, their were some who teach that "knowledge" itself was redemption because only the spiritual element in the human will actually be redeemed (1.21.4).

Although it is certainly possible that different Valentinian groups connected redemption with different rituals, with the evidence in *Philip*, it seems more likely that the Valentinians generally understood that all of their sacraments possessed the mysterious power of redemption, while the same sacraments did not for ordinary Christians. This interpretation would

also explain Hippolytus' enigmatic statement that the Marcosians performed a second baptism which is called "redemption." I wonder if the Marcosians had found it necessary to rebaptize their new converts in order to ensure their redemption once they left behind the ranks of the ordinary Christians.

5. *Conclusion*

This reconstruction of attitudes toward marriage in *Philip* certainly separates the Valentinians from other Gnostic sects which may have tended toward more encratitic lifestyles.[72] This study supports the conclusion that a sacramental marriage virtually was required between Valentinian Christians since it enacted and embodied the supernal hierogamy and the union of the transcendent aeons. This conclusion is in line with Clement of Alexandria's understanding of the Valentinians. In his famous tract *On Marriage* in which he vehemently writes against the encratitic lifestyle, he praises the Valentinians since they believe in the sanctity of marriage. He begins his book by stating: "The Valentinians, who hold that the union of man and woman is derived from the divine emanation in heaven above, approve of marriage" (Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀμφὶ τὸν Οὐαλεντῖνον ἄνωθεν ἐκ τῶν θείων προβολῶν τάς συζυγίας καταγαγόντες εὐαρεστοῦνται γάμῳ) (*Misc.* III,1,1). In the *Extracts of Theodotus*, he records that the Valentinians believe that procreation is "necessary for the salvation of the believers" because procreation must continue until all the children of the spiritual race have been born (67:4). Furthermore, so sacred is conception that it is compared to the mingling of the bodies of aeons Jesus, the Church, and Wisdom (17.1-4). Once the children are born, they are able to partake of the sacraments where they receive "the form of the Savior" and "become children of a bridal chamber" (ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ Σωτῆρος μορφωθέντες Ἀνδρὸς καὶ Νυμφῶνος γεγόναμεν τέκνα) (68:3-4).

This sacramental theology may help to shed light on a perplexing passage in the *Extracts of Theodotus*. In 27:1-6, Clement of Alexandria discusses the ascent of the soul into the intelligible realm. The ascent of the soul is said to be the entry of the high priest with "the Name engraved upon his heart" (τὸ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐγκεχαραγμένον Ὄνομα ἔχων) into the Holy of Holies. Before entering the Holy of Holies, he must first enter "the sec-

---

[72] This is in contradiction to Idel, "Sexual Metaphors", 211-214, who seems to associate all gnostics with encratism and the return to the primal androgyne state; also, in contrast, is M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 148-150.

ond veil" (τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦ δευτέρου), the *hekhal* where the altar of incense stands. The priest's body is said to already have been consecrated "like the golden plate" which is "pure and light through purification" since the body previously had been "engraved" with the "lustre of piety", being "clothed with the Name" (τὸ Ὄνομα περικείμενος).

The golden plate on the high priest's turban which has been decorated with the Tetragrammaton, is the body which has been consecrated through baptism and chrism, engraved with the Name. This investiture purifies the body so that the priest can enter the *hekhal*. As he enters, the body is laid aside revealing pure soul. Here he worships with "the angels who are the ministers of prayers carried aloft". Now he is ready to enter the Holy of Holies. As he does so, he is transformed completely into a spiritual body, as it were, "a body of the Power" (τὸ δυνάμεως). The work of "the Power" (τὸ δυνάμεως) is such that the person "becomes the bearer of God . . . as it were, his Body" (τὸ θεοφόρον γίνεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωτον . . . καθάπερ σώμα αὐτοῦ γινόμενον). Only then can the transformed person pass into the spiritual realm in order to "rest" with his "bridegroom", being granted "to see God 'face to face'".

It would seem that Clement is referring to a common Valentinian interpretation of the sacraments here, an interpretation not unlike what we have so far reconstructed from *Philip*.[73] The sacraments of baptism and chrism purify the body, etching the Name upon the person. This makes it possible for the person to enter the *hekhal* of the heavenly Temple. Within this holy room, the person is further transformed into the Body of God probably through partaking of the eucharist. Thusly transformed, he will be able to enter the Holy of Holies one day and marry his angel.

Illinois Wesleyan University
P.O. Box 2900 Bloomington IL 61702-2900

[73] This would argue for the case that this pericope represents Theodotus' views rather than those of Clement as Sagnard reconstructs: Sagnard, *Les Extraits de Théodote*, 11, 220-223. Thus, I agree with J. Buckley that this passage is consistent with Valentinianism. See her, *Female Fault and Fulfilment in Gnosticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986) 66-70.

L'ESPRIT SAINT ET LES ESPRITS MAUVAIS DANS LE *PASTEUR* D'HERMAS: SOURCES ET PROLONGEMENTS

PAR

NADIA IBRAHIM FREDRIKSON

Résumé. On s'intéressera tout particulièrement aux sources des enseignements dualistes de la pneumatologie du *Pasteur* d'Hermas, à la lumière des écrits qoumrâniens. On notera aussi que certains motifs à caractère dualiste, n'apparaissant pas dans les manuscrits de la secte, sont présents chez un auteur chrétien de langue syriaque du IVe siècle, Aphraate. Nous espérons par cette étude contribuer à la connaissance des sources et des prolongements des motifs à caractère dualiste caractéristiques de l'enseignement du *Pasteur* d'Hermas

Le *Pasteur* d'Hermas, ouvrage chrétien du second siècle centré sur la Pénitence, a été considéré comme une œuvre d'édification majeure au cours des premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne. Mais l'aspect sur lequel nous souhaiterions nous pencher est le caractère dualiste de la pneumatologie, par ailleurs très complexe, du *Pasteur* d'Hermas. L'étude de l'œuvre a en effet été renouvelée par la découverte des manuscrits de la Mer Morte. La confrontation des motifs à caractère dualistes du *Pasteur*, et de certains écrits qoumrâniens, notamment le Manuel de discipline, et les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, nous mènera à une première question: dans quelle mesure Hermas est-il tributaire des enseignements de la secte de Qoumrân?

Il apparaît en outre que la doctrine à caractère dualiste de l'habitation des esprits en l'homme d'Hermas est fondée sur la *Septante* de *I Samuel* 16, 14. Or cette source, qui n'apparaît pas dans les textes de Qoumrân, est bien présente dans l'oeuvre d'Aphraate, auteur chrétien de langue syriaque du IVe siècle, qui offre par ailleurs des parallèles intéressants avec les écrits de la Secte, notamment dans son exposé adressé "aux membres de l'ordre". Un autre motif retiendra notre attention: c'est la métaphore du mélange – peu savoureux – entre l'absinthe et le miel. Nous n'avons pas trouvé d'autre attestation de ce motif singulier ailleurs que chez Hermas et Aphraate. Ces deux auteurs auraient-ils en commun, dans leur enseignement à caractère dualiste, des sources ne relevant pas directement des écrits qoumrâniens?

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 262-280

Le *Pasteur* d'Hermas est un écrit curieux dont la pneumatologie laisse encore maintes questions ouvertes.[1] Sans reprendre ce volumineux dossier, notre étude portera sur l'enseignement dualiste dans le *Pasteur*, ses sources et ses prolongements éventuels.

La question des sources d'Hermas a longtemps posé problème, et la recherche actuelle s'accorde à reconnaître que l'auteur est issu d'un milieu complexe où se recoupent des influences juives, païennes et chrétiennes.[2] En effet, Hermas ne cite explicitement aucune de ses sources, si ce n'est le livre d'*Eldad et Modat* (7, 4), apocalypse apocryphe juive aujourd'hui perdue.[3] Ajoutons pour notre propos qu'Hermas a pu avoir connaissance d'une version du *Duae Viae*, traité juif des deux voies dont on retrouve la trace dans la *Didachè, l'Epître de Barnabas* et la *Doctrina Apostolorum*.[4]

La recherche a été renouvelée par la découverte des manuscrits de la Mer Morte, qui a mis en lumière l'importance des doctrines dualistes dans la théologie, l'anthropologie et l'eschatologie de la secte de Qoumrân.[5] Depuis lors, la pneumatologie du *Pasteur* d'Hermas est considérée à la lumière du dualisme essénien, et les études récentes ont mis l'accent sur les similitudes qui existent entre la doctrine des esprits dans le *Pasteur*, et l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits" de la *Règle de la Communauté*. Rappelons rapidement les principales étapes de la recherche.

A. Dupont-Sommer, dès 1953, a pressenti l'importance capitale de ces découvertes pour l'étude du christianisme primitif.[6] La même année, le Père Audet s'est attaché à montrer que le *Pasteur* d'Hermas est un ouvrage chrétien très fortement imprégné de judaïsme,[7] mais d'un type particulier: celui de la secte de Qoumrân.

---

[1] Pour les éditions du *Pasteur*, Whittaker, 1967, Funk-Bihlmeyer-Whittaker, 1992. Pour la traduction, Joly, 1986, que nous adapterons quand cela nous semblera nécessaire.

[2] Joly, 1992 a fait le point sur cette question, 552-586.

[3] La mention de cet ouvrage tendrait à montrer la familiarité d'Hermas avec la littérature apocryphe juive. Le livre d'*Eldad et Modat* est mentionné dans la *Stichométrie* de Nicéphore, cf. Burchard, 1965, 38; Denis, 1970, 142-145; Wilson, 1993, 162. Il semblerait qu'Hermas ait eu aussi connaissance de *IV Esdras* cf. Joly, 1986, 47, qui donne dans son édition les passages parallèles.

[4] Audet, 1952; pour le rapprochement entre le *Duae Viae* et le *Pasteur*; Rordorf – Tuilier, 1978, 22-34, posent le problème des dépendances littéraires éventuelles entre la *Didachè, le Pasteur*, et l'*Epître de Barnabas*. Voir aussi Philonenko dans Widengren – Hultgård – Philonenko, 1995, 180-181 note 123.

[5] Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko, 1998.

[6] Dupont-Sommer, 1953, 200.

[7] Audet, 1953, 56, analyse un certain nombre d'expressions, notamment κύριος, qui, dans le *Pasteur*, ne désigne jamais le Christ, mais Dieu.

C'est dans les "préceptes dualistes"[8] qu'Audet trouve les arguments de sa démonstration. Dans l'enseignement sur l'Esprit Saint et les esprits mauvais, il reconnaît l'influence de l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits". De surcroît, il met en évidence que le motif particulier de l'Esprit Saint souillé chez Hermas est une expression technique relevant des enseignements de la secte. Cette découverte, comme on le verra dans la suite de cette étude, conduit Audet à établir une filiation directe entre l'auteur du *Pasteur*, et la communauté de Qoumrân.[9]

Filiation est bien le mot qui résume la conclusion d'Audet, puisqu'il considère qu'Hermas était un esclave, fils d'Esséniens emmenés à Rome après les événements de 70. Hermas aurait alors rejoint une communauté chrétienne où il aurait retrouvé des juifs de même tradition que lui.[10]

Cette étude, qui a suscité certaines réserves, marque cependant une étape décisive dans l'approche du *Pasteur* d'Hermas: il faut désormais compter avec les manuscrits de la Mer Morte.[11] Nous laisserons cependant de côté la question des origines esséniennes de l'auteur du *Pasteur*, car l'hypothèse d'Audet, même si elle est plausible, reste difficile à vérifier. Il est certain que si elle était confirmée, les doutes seraient levés quant à la nature des relations qui existent entre Hermas et la secte de Qoumrân.

C'est dans les "préceptes dualistes" qu'Hermas développe un enseignement à caractère dualiste dont on perçoit l'écho diffus dans le reste de l'œuvre. Parmi les motifs dualistes développés dans le *Pasteur*, son développement sur l'habitation des esprits en l'homme retiendra tout particulièrement notre attention.[12] Nous souhaiterions donc reprendre les passages

---

[8] Expression que nous empruntons à Joly, 1986, pour désigner les Préceptes V, VI, VII, VIII. Mais pour la numérotation, nous reprendrons la méthode de Whittaker et Joly, qui divise l'œuvre en chapitres et paragraphes.

[9] *Idem*, 64-65.

[10] *Idem*, Audet prend pour autobiographique le début de l'oeuvre, quand Hermas mentionne son ancienne condition d'esclave (1, 1); il note en outre qu'Hermas était un nom d'esclave juif fréquent à Rome, 80-81. Wilson, 1993, 67, considère Hermas comme un "essénien chrétien". Les autres chercheurs restent sceptiques quant aux informations d'Hermas sur son passé, et penchent plutôt pour la fiction littéraire, cf. Joly, 1986, 17-21; Leutzsch, 1989, suggère cependant que les éléments autobiographiques du *Pasteur* sont plausibles, 138-141 [140].

[11] Lluis-Font, 1963, 83-98; Joly, 1992, critique cette position et présente un état de la question, 533-535. Les études plus récentes de Brox, 1991, Haas, 1992, Wilson, 1993, prennent en compte une filiation entre Hermas et la secte de Qoumrân.

[12] Ainsi retrouve-t-on chez Hermas les motifs des deux Esprits 33, 4, des deux voies, 35, des deux anges, 36, et des deux désirs, adaptation du motif juif des deux *yeser* 44-46, cf. Brox, 1991, 541-546 [543].

qui pourraient être examinés à la lumière de l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits" et d'autres écrits de la secte, ou apparentés à son idéologie. On songe ici aux Ecrits intertestamentaires, notamment aux *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, dont la pneumatologie est très proche de celle d'Hermas, comme l'a souligné Dibelius à maintes reprises dans son commentaire du *Pasteur*.[13]

Le Pasteur, messager céleste apparu à Hermas en *Vision* V, lui prodigue une révélation spéciale sur la Pénitence destinée à la communauté.[14] Cette révélation comprend un enseignement à caractère dualiste sur l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint en l'homme, et la menace que représentent les esprits mauvais qui s'efforcent de le chasser du "vase".[15] "Si tu es patient, l'Esprit Saint qui habite en toi sera pur de n'être pas obscurci par un autre esprit mauvais. Trouvant un large espace libre, il sera content, et il se réjouira avec le vase qu'il habite et il servira Dieu avec allégresse, puisqu'il aura en lui l'aisance. Mais si arrive un accès de colère, tout de suite, l'Esprit Saint, qui est délicat, se trouve à l'étroit sans espace pur, et il cherche à quitter ce lieu: il est étouffé par l'esprit mauvais, et il n'a plus d'espace où servir Dieu comme il veut, souillé qu'il est par la colère". (33, 2-3).

Le motif des deux esprits, si l'on s'en tient à l'Esprit Saint et la colère, s'inspire-t-il de la doctrine essénienne qui oppose l'Esprit de Vérité et l'Esprit de Perversion?

> Et Il a disposé pour l'homme deux Esprits
> pour qu'il marchât en eux jusqu'au moment de sa Visite:
> Ce sont les (deux) Esprits de Vérité et de Perversion.
> Dans une fontaine de lumière est l'origine de la Vérité
> et d'une source de ténèbres est l'origine de la Perversion (3, 18-19).

Ce sont donc les deux Esprits qui président à la destinée humaine. Cette doctrine d'origine iranienne a connu un développement particulier dans la secte juive de Qoumrân, et résume parfaitement le caractère dualiste de

---

[13] Dibelius, 1923. Pour l'édition des *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, Charles, 1908; Hollander-De Jonge, 1985. Pour la traduction française des *Testaments*, voir Philonenko dans Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko, 1999, 817-944. A propos du caractère essénien des *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, Philonenko, dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 178 et note 106.

[14] La figure du Pasteur rappelle celle du *Poimandres*, cf. Reitzenstein, 1904, 13-36; Joly, 1986, 48-51. Pour le motif du dieu grec Hermès représenté comme un berger, Dibelius, 422-423; Joly, 1986, 49-51.

[15] Par les détails donnés sur la nature et la "psychologie" des esprits, l'enseignement du Pasteur s'apparente à une doctrine du discernement des esprits; cf. 33, 7-34; le passage a d'ailleurs son parallèle dans la doctrine des deux anges, 36, 2.

son enseignement: Dieu a crée deux Esprits antithétiques, qui incarnent le bien et le mal, symbolisés par la lumière et des ténèbres. Ces deux Esprits luttent dans le monde, et dans le cœur de chacun, jusqu'à la victoire finale du bien sur le mal. Le Pasteur évoque lui aussi l'antithèse de l'Esprit Saint et de la colère; si ce motif est au cœur du cinquième précepte, la pneumatologie, dans son ensemble, est beaucoup plus complexe.[16]

En effet, le passage (33-34) qui traite de cette question est particulièrement confus. Alors que l'on s'attendrait à l'évocation de deux Esprits antithétiques, Hermas oppose à l'Esprit Saint (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), appelé aussi esprit juste (τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ δικαίου) (34, 7) un esprit mauvais (33, 2), ou une foule d'esprits mauvais (34, 4-5), identiques dans les effets de leur nature perverse.[17] De cette confrontation de l'un et du multiple ressort une seule fois le motif des deux Esprits (ἀμφότερα πνεύματα, 33, 4) dans la rencontre entre l'Esprit Saint et l'esprit mauvais, la colère:[18] "que ces deux esprits habitent ensemble est donc un grand malheur pour l'homme en qui ils habitent".

Cette conception de l'homme mû dans ses sentiments et ses actions par des esprits trouve un développement particulier dans les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*.[19] Et c'est dans les mêmes termes qu'Hermas stigmatise les vices sous la forme d'esprits mauvais. Ainsi en est-il, par exemple, de la colère, du doute et de la tristesse.[20]

---

[16] Brox, 1991, 217-222, et 541-546; il ne fait pas directement référence aux textes de Qoumrân, mais aux auteurs qui s'y réfèrent [545, n. 4].

[17] L'usage que fait Hermas de l'expression "Esprit Saint" mérite quelques éclaircissements. Audet, 1953, 13-82 [61-63], suggère qu'il ne peut être question d'une hypostase de la trinité chrétienne, et rapproche l'Esprit Saint d'Hermas de la Sagesse dans la tradition juive. Voir aussi Dibelius, 1923, 399; Brox, 1991, 542; Haas, 1992, 556-557. Nous considérons que pour Hermas, l'Esprit Saint est l'esprit que Dieu a mis en l'homme, mais qu'il faut le distinguer de l'âme. Ajoutons qu'en 33-34, Hermas évoque presque dans les mêmes termes l'Esprit Saint et la patience, auxquelles il oppose la colère. Peut-être cette équivalence entre l'esprit (πνεῦμα) et la patience (μακροθυμία) vient-elle de la traduction de l'hébreu *ruah*, que l'on traduit généralement par pneuma, mais aussi par μακροθυμία, quand il s'agit de dispositions de l'âme, cf. Tengström – Fabry, 1993, 385-425.

[18] Cf. Philonenko, 1987, 388-400 [394]. L'auteur indique dans son étude les rapprochements à faire avec la tradition dualiste iranienne.

[19] *Testament de Ruben* 2-3, pour le motif des sept esprits d'égarement.

[20] 40, 1. Cf. *Testament Dan*, 2-4. Sur la pneumatologie du *Pasteur d'Hermas*, cf. Dibelius, 517-519; Haas, 1992. D'après Galien, le célèbre médecin de l'Antiquité, il existe cinq maladies de l'âme: la tristesse, la colère, l'emportement, le désir, la crainte, cf. Van der Elst, 1914, 43.

Le caractère dualiste de la pneumatologie d'Hermas apparaît aussi dans sa doctrine des deux anges, posée avec plus de rigueur que celle des deux Esprits:[21]

> Il y a deux anges avec l'homme: l'un de justice, l'autre, du mal (36, 1).

Ce qui appelle un rapprochement avec l'enseignement de la *Règle de la Communauté*, qui évoque l'Ange des ténèbres, antithèse du Prince des lumières:[22]

> Dans la main du Prince des lumières
> Est l'empire sur tous les fils de justice:
> Dans des voies de lumière ils marchent;
> Et dans la main de l'Ange des ténèbres
> Est l'empire sur les fils de perversion:
> Et dans des voies de ténèbres ils marchent.

D'après le *Pasteur*, les esprits antithétiques ne peuvent cohabiter dans le même "vase" (σκεῦος), tandis que les deux anges sont simultanément présents avec (μετά) l'homme, comme les deux Esprits de la *Règle de la Communauté*. En outre, par leur nature, les deux anges du *Pasteur* rappellent les deux esprits précédemment évoqués: l'ange de justice est délicat (τρυφερός) (36, 3), comme l'Esprit Saint (33, 2);[23] mais parmi les oeuvres de l'ange du mal, apparaît la colère (36, 5).

Il convient également de souligner que la doctrine des deux anges, selon Hermas, est assortie d'une doctrine des deux voies:[24] "La justice suit une voie droite, l'injustice, une voie tortueuse. Suis donc la voie droite et unie, et laisse la voie tortueuse" (35, 2).[25] Ce motif, qui n'apparaît pas dans

---

[21] A propos des deux anges dans le *Pasteur*, Dibelius, 520-523, Daniélou, 1958, 414.

[22] 30, 20-21. Le texte fait référence à l'Ange des ténèbres, cf. 3, 21.

[23] On n'a pas trouvé d'interprétation vraiment satisfaisante de ce terme, dont la traduction "délicat" ne rend pas tout le sens. Cette formulation appliquée à l'Esprit Saint et à l'ange de justice semble être propre à Hermas. A propos du terme hébreu *'edaen* et de sa traduction en grec, cf. Kedar-Kopstein, 1986, 1093-1103 [1095]. On pourrait donc supposer que l'Esprit Saint et l'ange de justice sont délicats de par leur nature paradisiaque. Mais Hermas utilise aussi ce terme en mauvaise part, à propos de l'ange de volupté et d'erreur (ἄγγελος τῆς τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπατῆς), 42, 1. Par ailleurs, Hermas distingue les voluptés nuisibles (τρυφαὶ βλαβεραί) 65, 5, des voluptés qui sauvent (τρυφαὶ σώζουσαι) 65, 7, dans un exposé à caractère dualiste, 65.

[24] Cf. *Epître de Barnabas*, 18, 1b (Prigent-Kraft, 1971, 195-197); *Didachè*, 1, 1 (cf. Rordorf-Tuilier, 1978, 22-34).

[25] A propos des deux voies dans le *Pasteur*, cf. Taylor, 1893, 243-259, suggère qu'Hermas s'est inspiré de la *Fable de Prodikos* et de l'*Epître de Barnabas*, 18, 1c, qui associe le motif des deux voies et des deux anges. Voir aussi Rordorf-Tuilier, 1978, 22-34; Brox, 1991, 222-227.

les principaux écrits esséniens, est cependant expressément attesté dans le fragment 4Q 473:[26]

> 3. (Il y a) D[eux] voies, une bonn[e et une mauvaise. Si vous marchez dans la bonne voie Il vous protègera (?)]
> 4. Et vous bénira. Mais si vous marchez dans la (mauvaise) voie,
> 5. [Il vous maudira et vous insultera (?), et le mal] Il amène[ra] sur vous et vous détruira

Les Esséniens avaient donc connaissance d'une doctrine des deux voies, mais l'état lacuneux du fragment ne permet pas d'affirmer qu'elle soit associée à une doctrine des deux anges. On notera toutefois la mention d'ange[s de la destruction] à la ligne 7. Le thème des deux voies suppose un libre arbitre; c'est peut-être la raison pour laquelle il n'apparaît pas dans la *Règle de la Communauté*, qui pose le principe de la prédestination divine.[27]

Une autre caractéristique du dualisme qoumrânien doit encore être examinée avec soin. En effet, l'enseignement sur les deux Esprits et les deux anges est fondé sur l'antithèse de la lumière et des ténèbres. Dans quelle mesure la retrouve-t-on dans le *Pasteur*?[28] A priori, ce motif n'est pas directement présent dans les préceptes dualistes; mais il nous semble sous-jacent dans l'évocation de la dynamique de l'Esprit Saint et l'esprit mauvais en l'homme. Reprenons un instant ce passage.

Dans les paragraphe 33-34, il est question des conséquences néfastes de la colère (ὀξυχολία), et la nécessité de maîtriser ses emportements. On retrouve ici un thème cher à la philosophie grecque, celui de l'ἐγκρατεία,[29] présent aussi bien chez Philon,[30] Josèphe,[31] et dans les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*.[32]

Ainsi, comme l'explique le Pasteur à Hermas, quand la colère monte au cœur de l'homme, elle occupe tout le "vase" (σκεῦος) et l'Esprit, qui a besoin d'espace large, se sent à l'étroit.[33] Ce manque d'espace provoque

---

[26] Cf. VanderKam, *D.J.D.*, vol. 22, 289-294; et pour les deux voies, texte en anglais [293] dont nous avons proposé une traduction française.

[27] Cf. Philonenko dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 181 et note 22.

[28] A propos du terme hébreu *hasak*, ténèbres, voir Lutzmann – Geraty – Ringgren – Mitchell, 1982, 576-277; sur l'origine iranienne de l'antithèse lumière/ténèbres, Philonenko, dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 163-171.

[29] Chadwick, 1962, 343-365.

[30] Philon d'Alexandrie, *De vita contemplativa*, 34, 103.

[31] Cité par Dupont-Sommer, 1959, 5e édition, 1996, 40.

[32] *Testament Dan*, 1, 7-8; cf. Haas 1992, 554-564.

[33] L'antithèse, du large et de l'étroit, qui n'appartient apparemment pas au vocabu-

l'obscurcissement de l'Esprit Saint, qui est enténébré (ἐπισκοτούμενον) par l'esprit mauvais (33, 2). De même, dans le *Pasteur*, celui que possèdent les esprits mauvais engendrés par la colère devient "complètement aveugle, loin de la droite raison" (34, 7).[34] Nous sommes bien dans le champ sémantique du dualisme qoumrânien: c'est l'Esprit de perversité qui provoque l'aveuglement et entraîne l'homme dans les ténèbres (*Règle de la Communauté*, 4, 11). On peut donc, sans forcer le texte, rapprocher les thèmes de l'esprit enténébré, et de l'aveuglement, et considérer la colère comme un esprit de ténèbres, et implicitement l'Esprit Saint, comme un esprit de lumière.[35]

Par ailleurs, Hermas représente les esprits saints et les esprits mauvais sous les traits de douze vierges vêtues de blanc et douze femmes vêtues de noir.[36] Ainsi personnifiés, les esprits sont revêtus selon leur nature de couleurs qui symbolisent la lumière et les ténèbres.[37] Un autre motif spécifique de la rencontre des deux esprits dans le *Pasteur*, est celui de la "souillure".

En effet, l'Esprit Saint est "souillé" (μιαινούμενον) par la colère (33, 3). A notre connaissance, cette métaphore n'apparaît que dans deux écrits qoumrâniens.[38] Audet a en effet montré que l'expression "Esprit Saint souillé" apparaît deux fois dans l'*Ecrit de Damas*, ce qui, pour lui, suffirait à justifier une dépendance littéraire entre ces deux œuvres.[39] Plus récemment, A. Caquot, a retrouvé d'autres attestations de ce motif: l'une dans un nouveau fragment de l'*Ecrit de Damas*, et l'autre, dans le *Testament hébreu de Nephtali*.[40] Le thème de l'Esprit Saint souillé semble donc bien d'origine qoumrânienne, d'autant plus que dans la *Règle de la Communauté*, il est explicitement question de "l'esprit de souillure".

---

laire de la secte, est pourtant attestée dans une œuvre aux attaches qoumrâniennes dont Hermas s'est probablement inspiré, *IV Esdras*, Philonenko, 1971, 421-427.

[34] A comparer avec *Testament Dan*, 2-3.

[35] Haas, 1992, 555-557.

[36] *Le Pasteur*, 79, 3-4; 86, 5; Leutzsch, 1989, 179-185.

[37] Cf. Brox, 1991, 403 ss. Ajoutons que dans le *Pasteur*, les vierges sont à la fois des esprits saints, et les puissances du Fils de Dieu, 90, 2; les femmes sont implicitement associées à des puissances mauvaises (90,8-9; 103, 8).

[38] Brox, 1991, 219, suggère que c'est la demeure qui est souillée; et non l'esprit Saint. Mais cette lecture ne nous semble guère satisfaisante, vu le contexte général du passage.

[39] Audet, 1953, 64-65, cite l'*Ecrit de Damas* 5, 11-12 et 7, 3.

[40] Caquot, 1994, 373-380, retrouve dans un nouveau fragment de l'*Ecrit de Damas* l'expression "en souillant son Esprit Saint", et l'interprète comme l'esprit divin que Dieu

On lit en effet qu'au moment de la Visite divine seront "Finies toutes les abominations mensongères, fini le souillement par l'esprit de souillure". (4, 21-22). En l'absence d'autres sources, force est de constater que le motif de l'Esprit Saint souillé appartient au vocabulaire spécifique de la secte de Qoumrân. On notera entre outre que le motif de la souillure apparaît encore, mais en termes moins explicites, à propos de l'esprit de vérité.

En effet, une autre spécificité de la doctrine des deux esprits dans le *Pasteur*, est l'expression "esprit de vérité" pour désigner l'Esprit Saint.[41] Or, l'esprit de vérité est bien l'un des deux Esprits de la doctrine dualiste de la secte, opposé à l'esprit de perversion.[42] Selon M. Philonenko, ce motif est issu de la tradition iranienne qui oppose la vérité "*asa*" au mensonge, "*drug*".[43] Pour Hermas, l'antithèse de l'esprit de vérité n'est exactement le mensonge, mais la mauvaise conscience, consécutive au mensonge:[44] "Tu aurais dû, comme serviteur de Dieu, marcher dans la vérité, ne pas faire cohabiter en toi une mauvaise conscience avec l'esprit de vérité" (28, 4).[45]

Cet esprit de vérité est d'origine divine; et "le Seigneur est vrai en toutes ses paroles et il n'y a en lui aucun mensonge" (28, 1).[46] Les menteurs pervertissent l'esprit donné par Dieu: "Car ils ont reçu de lui un esprit qui ne ment pas; s'ils le lui rendent mensonger, ils souillent (ἐμίαναν) le commandement du Seigneur et se font spoliateurs" (28, 2);[47] on retrouve ici le

---

a placé en l'homme. Dans le *Testament hébreu de Nephtali*, on lit: "Heureux l'homme qui ne souille pas le saint esprit de Dieu qu'Il a mis en nous".

[41] L'esprit de vérité apparaît une seule fois dans le *Pasteur*, 28, 4.

[42] *Règle de la Communauté*, 3, 18-19; 4, 23-26.

[43] Philonenko dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko, 1995, 171.

[44] Les thèmes de la vérité et du mensonge sont particulièrement complexes chez Hermas. Ainsi, on apprend en (28, 5) qu'Hermas a beaucoup menti dans sa vie, mais le Pasteur lui enjoint d'écouter ses paroles: "observe-les: ainsi, même les mensonges que tu faisais antérieurement dans tes affaires obtiendront créance, puisqu'on trouvera vrai ton langage d'aujourd'hui". Dans un autre contexte, la vérité peut provenir du diable afin de perdre les justes: c'est ainsi qu'agissent les faux prophètes (43, 4). Cf. *I Rois* 22, 19-22; Wilson, 1993, 63-72.

[45] Le *Testament de Juda* oppose "l'esprit de vérité (πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) et l'esprit d'égarement (πνεῦμα τῆς πλανῆς)". Entre les deux, se trouve la "conscience intelligente", ce qui montre une évolution de la doctrine en plaçant entre les deux Esprits la "conscience intelligente". La "mauvaise conscience" d'Hermas est peut-être tout simplement la "conscience" qui a choisi le mensonge, plutôt que de l'esprit de vérité.

[46] A l'inverse, dans le IVe Evangile, le diable est appelé "père du mensonge" *Jean*, 8, 44.

[47] On aura noté qu'en 33, 3, c'est la colère qui souille l'Esprit Saint. Comparer ce passage d'Hermas sur le mensonge à *I Jean* 1, 8-10. Cf. Haas 1992, 568-570.

thème de la souillure évoqué précédemment: le mensonge et la colère ont les mêmes effets pervers.[48]

En outre, un rapprochement de notre passage avec le *Testament de Juda*, permet de préciser le rôle de témoin de l'esprit de vérité, qui rend compte à Dieu des actions humaines;[49] dans le *Pasteur*, ce rôle est celui de l'Esprit Saint dont il faut éloigner la tristesse: "de peur qu'il ne prie Dieu contre toi et ne s'éloigne de toi." (41, 5). Dans les deux cas, l'esprit de vérité, comme l'Esprit Saint, ont le même rôle d'accusateur auprès de Dieu.[50]

Si l'esprit de vérité est, comme on s'est efforcé de le montrer, une autre dénomination de l'Esprit Saint, la vérité est pour Hermas une vertu fondamentale. Nous en voulons pour preuve l'exhortation qui introduit l'enseignement sur l'esprit de vérité: "Aime la vérité, qu'elle seule puisse sortir de ta bouche (28, 1)".

Nous sommes à nouveau confronté à une expression à caractère technique qui rappelle singulièrement les impératifs de la communauté de Qoumrân. D'après le témoignage de Flavius Josèphe, les futurs membres de la communauté juraient "d'aimer toujours la vérité et de poursuivre les menteurs".[51] Mais chez Hermas, cette exorde n'implique pas la haine du mensonge: de l'antithèse attestée par ailleurs il ne retient que la formule positive. La formule "aimer la vérité" est également attestée dans la littérature intertestamentaire et les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*.[52]

Si l'expression "aime la vérité" peut apparaître chez Hermas comme la partie positive d'une formule antithétique incomplète, on relève à l'inverse un passage caractérisé une exhortation "négative" qui rappelle les écrits dualistes les plus radicaux. Dans le paragraphe consacré aux deux désirs, motif qui rappelle celui des deux penchants dans le *Testament d'Aser*,[53] le Pasteur formule un commandement de haine: "Ecarte de toi tout mauvais

---

[48] *Testament de Dan*, 3, 6: le mensonge est associé à la colère; et ces deux vices "vont à la droite de Satan".

[49] *Testament de Juda*, 20, 5: "L'esprit de vérité atteste toutes ces choses et accuse tous les hommes (. . .)".

[50] *Idem*, 20, 5; cf. *Haas*, 1992, 564-568. Le motif de l'Esprit accusant le pécheur apparaît aussi chez Aphraate: "Mais l'homme qui aura reçu l'Esprit aux eaux (baptismales) et l'aura contristé, ~ il le quittera avant qu'il ne meure, et il s'en ira, suivant sa condition, auprès du Messie porter plainte contre cet homme qui l'aura contristé" (*Exposé* 6, I, 296, Pierre, 1988, I, 402).

[51] Philonenko, 1998, 1, cf. Flavius Josèphe, *Guerre juive*, 2, 8, 141.

[52] Cf. *I Hénoch* 91, 13; *Testament Ruben* 3, 9; *Testament Dan* 6, 8. En 5, 1-2, il est spécifié "Haïssez le mensonge (. . .) dites chacun la vérité à votre prochain".

[53] *Testament d'Aser*, 1, 3, voir Hadot, 1970, 167.

désir, revêts-toi du désir bon et saint. Car revêtu de ce désir, tu haïras le désir mauvais, tu lui mettras un frein comme tu voudras" (44, 1). Cette formulation rappelle l'"Instruction sur les deux Esprits (*Règle de la Communauté*, 4, 23-25)":

> Jusqu'à présent luttent les (deux) Esprits de vérité et de perversion dans le cœur [d'un chacun:
> (les hommes) marchent dans la Sagesse et dans la Folie
> et conformément au partage d'un chacun dans la vérité et la justice,
> ainsi il hait la Perversité;
> et (selon) son héritage dans le lot de la Perversion et (selon) l'impiété (qui est) en lui
> ainsi il abomine la vérité.

Mais le commandement de haine que nous venons de relever est unique dans le *Pasteur*. En effet, bien que l'auteur pose l'existence de principes antithétiques tels que les deux esprits, les deux anges, les deux voies, les deux désirs, sa théologie est fondée sur la toute puissance de Dieu et le soutien de l'Ange de pénitence aux croyants: "Et moi, l'Ange de la pénitence, je vous le dis: ne craignez pas le diable, car j'ai été envoyé, dit-il, pour être avec vous qui faites pénitence du fond du cœur et pour vous affermir dans la foi" (49, 1).[54]

Cette pénitence, largement ouverte à tous, paraît exclure l'idée d'une division des hommes en deux lots, les fils de lumière, et les fils des ténèbres, caractéristique de la doctrine dualiste de Qoumrân.[55] On trouve pourtant chez Hermas deux expressions qui pourraient paraître équivalentes à cette doctrine. La tour formée par des pierres éclatantes, en *Similitude* IX, est une allégorie de l'Eglise idéale. Mais ceux qui se sont souillés (ἐμίαναν) sont rejetés "du peuple des justes" (ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν δικαίων) (94, 5). Dans la *Vision* III, texte parallèle à celui que l'on vient de citer, les pierres rejetées

---

[54] Cf. 48, où Hermas affirme que les croyants ont le pouvoir de triompher sur le diable; mais les hommes vides de foi deviennent ses esclaves: "il va alors vers ceux qui ne sont pas bien remplis (de la foi), il trouve de la place et entre en eux: il fait en eux ce qu'il veut; ils deviennent pour lui ses esclaves" (48, 4). On retrouve ici une variante du motif de l'habitation.

[55] Philonenko dans Widengren-Hultgård-Philonenko,1995, 177-178. Cf. Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko, 1999, *Le Règlement de la guerre*, 191-226. L'expression fils de lumière est appliquée aux "membres de l'ordre" Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 2, Pierre 1988, I, 371; les fils des ténèbres sont les adeptes de Mani, *Exposé* 3, 9, Pierre, 1988, I, 279. Les Mandéens, eux aussi, connaissent l'expression "fils de lumière (*bnia nhura*) – fils de ténèbres (*bnia hsuka*)" cf. Philonenko 1995, 169 et note 55; reconnaît à cette expression un caractère qoumrânien, *idem*, 167-169.

de la tour sont les "fils d'iniquité" (υἱοὶ τῆς ἀνομίας) (14, 1).[56] Il y a donc séparation entre les justes, et les fils de l'iniquité, mais pas au terme d'une guerre eschatologique, comme dans les textes de Qoumrân: c'est Dieu qui effectue le tri entre les vrais croyants, et les autres (14, 1).

Mais ni les textes de Qoumrân, ni le *Pasteur* ne prônent un dualisme absolu. D'après la *Règle de la Communauté* (3, 25-26), c'est Dieu qui a créé les deux Esprits. La guerre finale des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres s'achèvera par la victoire du bien sur le mal, de la lumière sur les ténèbres. De même lit-on chez Hermas: "Le diable a le pouvoir de lutter, il n'a pas celui de triompher" (48, 2); mais c'est le Pasteur, l'Ange de la Pénitence, qui triomphe du diable.[57]

Nous avons jusqu'à présent relevé les éléments de comparaison entre l'enseignement à caractère dualiste sur les esprits dans le *Pasteur* d'Hermas, et la doctrine des deux Esprits dans les textes de Qoumrân, en élargissant notre étude aux écrits intertestamentaires. Pourtant, deux motifs spécifiques à la pneumatologie d'Hermas n'apparaissent pas dans cette famille de textes, et n'ont pas fait l'objet d'une étude approfondie.

Rappelons tout d'abord que la pneumatologie d'Hermas s'inscrit dans une dynamique de l'habitation – ou l'abandon – de l'Esprit Saint de la demeure qu'il occupe. Ce motif est fondé sur la *Septante* de *I Samuel* 16, 14. En outre, parmi les nombreuses métaphores dont use Hermas, on relèvera celle de l'absinthe et du miel pour figurer l'impossible cohabitation de l'Esprit Saint et la colère. Or, ces deux motifs propres à Hermas sont attestés dans les *Exposés* d'Aphraate, auteur chrétien de langue syriaque du IVe siècle. Ces deux auteurs seraient-ils tributaires de mêmes sources, indépendantes des textes de Qoumrân ?

En (33, 3), Hermas dit explicitement que sous l'effet de la colère, l'Esprit Saint est "étranglé" (ἔπνιγεν) par l'esprit mauvais (33, 4).[58] Le verbe "πνίγειν" apparaît une fois dans la *Septante* et une fois dans le *Nouveau Testament* dans des récits de "possession" par un ou des esprits mauvais – ou impurs.[59]

Selon le récit de *I Samuel* 16, 14 de la *Septante*, l'esprit de Dieu s'est retiré de Saül, et Dieu lui a envoyé un esprit mauvais qui l'étrangle: "ἔπνιγεν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν παρὰ κυρίου". Comme on l'a noté, Hermas décrit

---

[56] "ils n'ont eu qu'une foi hypocrite et ne se sont pas dépouillés de tout mal. C'est pourquoi ils n'obtiennent pas le salut (. . .)" 14, 1.

[57] *Le Pasteur*, 47, 7; 49, 1; Daniélou 1958, 144-145.

[58] En 41, 5, Hermas emploie l'expression "μὴ θλῖβε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον", cf. *Eph.* 4, 30.

[59] *I Sam.* 16, 14 (seule occurrence dans la *Septante*); *Mc* 5, 18.

selon les mêmes termes l'action de la colère sur l'Esprit Saint. La similitude de la terminologie atteste une dépendance littéraire à laquelle Hermas apporte cependant deux nuances. C'est l'Esprit Saint, et non pas l'homme, qui est étranglé par l'esprit mauvais; il est ensuite chassé par la colère. En *I Samuel* 16, 14, c'est Dieu qui a retiré son esprit de Saül, pour le remplacer par un esprit mauvais: il n'y a donc pas choc entre les deux Esprits, mais bien plutôt va-et-vient de l'un ou de l'autre.[60]

Dans son *Exposé* 6, consacré aux "Membres de l'ordre", Aphraate veut donner des exemples convaincants du caractère discontinu de la présence de l'Esprit de Dieu en l'homme. Il commence par évoquer le cas de Saül: "l'Esprit Saint dont il avait été oint le quitta parce qu'il l'avait contristé – et Dieu lui envoya à la place un esprit tourmenteur. Quand il était opprimé par l'esprit mauvais – David jouait de la cithare".[61]

Aphraate, comme Hermas, désigne l'esprit de Dieu par cette expression spécifique, et non attestée en *I Samuel* 16, 14, "l'esprit saint". Il ajoute que Saül l'avait "contristé", précision qui n'apparaît pas non plus dans la source, mais qui donne lieu à de plus amples développements dans le *Pasteur*. Il définit en effet la tristesse comme le plus méchant de tous les esprits (40, 2); elle "attriste (λυπεῖ) l'Esprit Saint et le chasse" (41, 2).[62] Chez ces deux auteurs, la tristesse a pour effet de chasser l'Esprit Saint de sa demeure.

Un autre point qui a déjà retenu notre attention, le motif de l'Esprit Saint souillé, semble également attesté chez Aphraate. Dans son *Exposé* IX, intitulé "de l'Humilité", il examine différents cas de jalousie à travers des exemples scripturaires. Ainsi revient-il à l'histoire de Saül: "Quiconque se revêt de jalousie, le Mauvais habite en lui, ~ et habite en lui l'esprit souillé qui habitait en Saül".[63]

On retrouve donc chez Hermas et Aphraate une même conception, avec des nuances, de l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint ou de l'esprit mauvais en l'homme, qui n'est qu'une variante du motif de l'habitation de Dieu ou du diable. Ainsi, selon Hermas, la colère a chassé l'Esprit Saint: "Mais quand il s'éloigne de l'homme, en qui il habitait, cet homme se vide de l'esprit juste et désormais plein des esprits mauvais, il s'agite dans tous ses

[60] Cf. Philonenko, 1987, note qu'à la différence de la tradition iranienne des deux Esprits, il n'y a pas mélange, mais "choc et percussion" d'un esprit qui chasse l'autre pour prendre sa place, 397-398. Voir aussi Seitz, 1959-1960, 87-88.

[61] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 16, cf. Pierre, 1988, I, 404; voir aussi *Exposé* 6, 14, 400; 6, 18, 409.

[62] De même, le doute et la colère attristent (λυπεῖ) l'Esprit Saint (41, 4), *Ephésiens* 4, 30. Cf. Dibelius, 531-536.

[63] Aphraate, *Exposé* 9, Pierre, 1988, I, 486.

actes" (34, 7).[64] Chez Aphraate, l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint en l'homme n'est pas continue; et c'est en son absence que Satan prend sa place: "Lorsque l'Esprit Saint quitte l'homme qui l'a reçu, le temps d'aller et de revenir chez lui – Satan engage le combat contre cet homme – de manière à le faire dévier et que l'Esprit Saint s'éloigne définitivement de lui".[65]

L'idée de l'habitation de Dieu ou du diable en l'homme est par ailleurs bien présente dans les préceptes dualistes: "le Seigneur habite dans la patience, et le diable, dans la colère" (33, 3). De même lit-on chez Aphraate, à propos de l'Adversaire des fidèles: "S'il entend qu'un homme en qui demeure le Messie dit des paroles honteuses ou se met en colère, qu'il se querelle et se bat, – alors Satan sait que le Messie n'est pas en lui: – il vient et exécute en lui sa volonté. Car le Messie demeure chez les pacifiques et les humbles (. . .)".[66]

Il apparaît donc que Hermas, tout comme Aphraate, ont trouvé en *I Samuel* 16, 14 la justification de leur doctrine de l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint – ou de l'esprit mauvais – en l'homme. Indépendamment de cette source, on retrouve chez les deux auteurs le motif de "l'esprit souillé", dont on a évoqué précédemment la rareté. On sera peut-être plus surpris de constater que ces deux auteurs font référence à la même métaphore. Certes, l'absinthe et le miel, pour évoquer la douceur et l'amertume, apparaissent quelques fois sous la plume des auteurs anciens.[67] Mais il est question de comparaison, en aucun cas de mélange.

---

[64] Cf. Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 17, Pierre, 1988, I, 405: " Il est pour l'homme un recours: ~ à l'heure où il se sent agité, où son esprit n'est plus ardent et où son cœur tombe dans les pensées de ce monde, ~ qu'il sache que l'Esprit n'est plus en lui."

[65] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 17, Pierre, 1988, I, 405. On peut supposer que l'Esprit Saint s'éloigne de celui qui pèche: "C'est que cet Esprit va sans cesse se tenir devant Dieu et voir sa face, ~ et celui qui a fait du tort au temple où il habite, il porte plainte contre lui devant Dieu" (*Exposé* 6, 15, Pierre, 1988, I, 404).

[66] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 17, Pierre, I, 1988, 406. *Le Pasteur*, 33, 3. 6; 34, 6.

[67] Le terme d'absinthe ne figure pas dans la *Septante*, qui traduit le terme hébreu de *laʿ anah* par différents termes (πικρία, χολή, ὀδύνη, ἀνάγκαι), mais on le retrouve chez Aquila. Il n'est pas certain que *laʿ anah* évoque précisément l'absinthe, bien qu'il désigne une plante amère, voire un poison, cf. Seybold, 1984, 586-588. Les traductions françaises adoptent l'antithèse absinthe/miel pour *Proverbes* 5, 4. L'antithèse équivalente doux/amer se retrouve dans les *Ecrits intertestamentaires*: *Testament Gad*, 5, 1 (cf. *Esaïe* 5, 20) où elle est associée à lumière/ténèbres; *Vie grecque d'Adam et Eve* 24, 3; *Apocalypse grecque de Baruch*, 4, 15. Dans le *Nouveau Testament*, Absinthe est le nom de l'étoile qui empoisonne les eaux, *Apocalypse* 8, 11. Voir Dibelius, 515, pour d'autres exemples de la métaphore absinthe/miel. Le miel joue un rôle symbolique dans *Joseph et Aséneth*, 16, 8. Voir aussi Bousset, 1907, 312, pour le rôle du miel chez les mystes.

Pour Hermas, la rencontre de la patience et de la colère est comparée au mélange du miel et de l'absinthe: "Si tu prends une toute petite goutte d'absinthe et que tu la verses dans un pot de miel, n'est-il pas vrai que tout le miel est perdu, que tant de miel est gâté par si peu d'absinthe, qu'elle corrompt la douceur (γλυκύτητα) du miel, qui n'a plus le même charme (χάριν) pour le maître, puisqu'il est devenu amer (ἐπικράνθη) et a perdu son utilité ?" (33, 5).[68]

Aphraate reprend cette métaphore non à propos des esprits, mais du jeûne, et de la pureté qu'il exige: "Il ne convient pas en effet à un homme – de mêler le miel et l'absinthe –. Si en effet, l'on s'abstient de pain et d'eau –, il ne faut pas mêler injures et malédictions à son jeûne".[69] Quand Hermas évoque le mélange du miel et de l'absinthe, il se rattache à la tradition juive du doux et de l'amer.[70] Mais on notera qu'il existe un décalage entre le motif de l'impossible cohabitation des esprits, puisque la colère chasse l'Esprit Saint (33, 3), et la métaphore du mélange peu savoureux de l'absinthe et du miel. Elle ajoute cependant une nouvelle antithèse, douceur/amertume,[71] à celles, sous-entendues, qui précèdent: lumière/ ténèbres; pureté/souillure, étroit/large. Ainsi, dans le *Pasteur*, l'ange du mal est amer (πίκρος), (36, 4), tout comme les préceptes du diable (πικραίς), alors qu'il n'y a rien de plus doux (γλυκύτερον) que les préceptes de Dieu, (47, 6). Aphraate évoque dans les mêmes termes l'action de l'Adversaire qui s'insinue dans les fidèles: "S'il fait semblant d'être doux pour entrer chez eux, – ils ne le goûtent pas, parce qu'ils savent qu'il est amer".[72]

Pour Aphraate, le miel, c'est le jeûne qui est agréable à Dieu. Selon Hermas, c'est à la fois l'Esprit Saint, et la patience, dans laquelle Dieu se complaît. Aphraate compare l'absinthe aux injures et à la malédiction; pour Hermas, c'est la colère, dans laquelle demeure le diable.

Malgré ces différences de propos, les deux auteurs se rejoignent pour une même conclusion: il ne faut pas mélanger le miel et l'absinthe, car celle-ci corrompt irrémédiablement l'offrande faite à Dieu, qu'il s'agisse de la prière (33, 6) ou du jeûne. En outre, Hermas et Aphraate se rattachent à la tradition juive du doux et de l'amer: le miel par sa douceur évoque la divinité, tandis que l'amertume est propre au diable.

---

[68] De même, Hermas compare la tristesse mêlée à la prière au mélange du vinaigre et du vin (42, 3).

[69] Aphraate, *Exposé* 3, 2, Pierre, 1988, I, 271 et note 10.

[70] Cf. note 67. Brox, 1991, 219.

[71] 34.3.

[72] Aphraate, *Exposé* 6, 2, Pierre, 1988 I, 372.

Au terme de cet exposé, nous espérons avons montré que dans la pneumatologie foisonnante du *Pasteur* d'Hermas, certains motifs semblent attester une dépendance littéraire avec les textes de Qoumrân. Certes, il semblerait hâtif de vouloir reconnaître dans les Préceptes dualistes une reprise de "l'Instruction sur les deux Esprits" de la secte de Qoumrân. Nous avons en effet souligné que l'expression "les deux esprits" (ἀμρότερα πνεύματα) n'apparaît qu'une seule fois dans le *Pasteur*, et qu'il est par ailleurs surtout question de l'antagonisme entre l'un et le multiple, l'Esprit Saint et les esprits mauvais, qui nous ramène plutôt vers les *Testaments des douze Patriarches*, notamment pour ce qui concerne la colère et la tristesse, considérés par Hermas comme deux esprits mauvais qui chassent l'Esprit saint.

Cependant, nous rejoignons Audet pour penser que l'expression "Esprit Saint souillé" apparaît comme le maillon le plus sûr de la chaîne. Cette formulation à caractère technique n'est attestée, pour le moment, que dans des écrits issus ou proches de la secte de Qoumrân.

Le motif des deux anges et des deux voies relevé chez Hermas a aussi été relevé dans les textes de Qoumrân; nous serons cependant plus prudents pour ce qui concerne une dépendance littéraire directe, car on s'est efforcé de montrer que ces motifs apparaissent dans d'autres écrits chrétiens des premiers siècles, et que le motif des deux voies est un "classique" de la sagesse de la Grèce antique.

Si depuis la découverte des textes de Qoumrân, l'attention s'est surtout portée sur le caractère "dualiste" de la pneumatologie d'Hermas, nous avons souhaité souligner un aspect qui nous semble tout aussi important, c'est le "modèle" qui structure sa pensée. En effet, l'enseignement dualiste d'Hermas s'inscrit dans le contexte de l'habitation de l'Esprit Saint en l'homme, de sa présence, ou son absence. On a montré que le motif de l'Esprit Saint "étranglé" s'inspire de la *Septante de I Samuel* 16, 14.

Aphraate comme Hermas appelle l'Esprit de Dieu "Esprit Saint", et désigne la tristesse comme une des raisons de l'abandon de l'Esprit Saint de la demeure où il habite. En outre, il connaît lui aussi le motif de la "souillure", puisqu'il décrit l'esprit mauvais qui habitait en Saül comme un "esprit souillé". Ces recoupements posent bien sûr le problème d'un lien éventuel entre Aphraate et Hermas; et la proximité littéraire entre ces deux textes est renforcée par l'usage qu'ils font tous deux de la métaphore du mélange de l'absinthe et du miel.

Aphraate s'inspire-t-il d'Hermas ? A priori, les deux auteurs n'ont pas le même propos, et si le message d'Hermas semble universel, celui d'Aphraate évoque les "membres de l'ordre" dont l'identification pose encore de nom-

breux problèmes, mais qui par bien des aspects rappellent les membres de la secte de Qoumrân.[73] Il nous semblerait plutôt qu'Hermas et Aphraate ont eu accès à une même source qui devait elle même fonder son enseignement de l'habitation de Dieu en l'homme sur *I Samuel* 16, 14; car c'est essentiellement sur ce point-là que les auteurs se rejoignent. Dans l'état actuel des recherches sur les textes de Qoumrân, il n'apparaît pas que ces motifs appartiennent aux écrits de la secte; mais de nouvelles découvertes permettront peut-être d'en savoir plus.

Quant aux liens éventuels entre Aphraate et la secte de Qoumrân, malgré des points communs frappants que l'on a rapidement évoqués, car ils n'entraient pas directement dans le cadre de cette étude, ils restent tributaires de notre connaissance du devenir de la secte après sa disparition. Et cette question, si elle était résolue, permettrait d'apporter un nouvel éclairage à certains écrits chrétiens des premiers siècles, dont, notamment, le *Pasteur* d'Hermas.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Audet, 1952, 1953: J.P. Audet, "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du *Manuel de Discipline*", *Revue Biblique* 59, 1952; p. 219-238 et 60, 1953, p. 43-82.

Bousset, 1907: *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907.

Brox, 1991: N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Göttingen, 1991.

Burchard, 1965: C. Burchard, *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth*, Tübingen, 1965.

Caquot, 1994: A. Caquot, "Nouveaux fragments de l'*Ecrit de Damas*", *RHPR* 74, 1994, p. 373-380.

Chadwick, 1962: H. Chadwick, "*Enkrateia*", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* V, Stuttgart, 1962, p. 343-365.

Charles, 1908: R.H. Charles, *The greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford, 1908.

Daniélou, 1958: J. Daniélou, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*, Paris, 1958.

Denis, 1970: A.M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament*, Leyde, 1970.

Dibelius, 1923: M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Tübingen, 1923.

---

[73] Voir aussi l'étude de Jargy, 1951, à propos de l'expression syriaque *b'nay wabhnôth k'yomô*, qu'il traduit par "fils et filles du Pacte". Cette traduction est préférable à celle de Pierre, 1988-1989, (membres de l'Ordre). On notera que la traduction possible "Fils et filles de l'Alliance" rappelle les "Fils de l'Alliance", les Esséniens, avec lesquels les auditeurs d'Aphraate présentent des affinités, Pierre 1988, I, 113. Cf. Aphraate, *Exposé* 6: les "membres de l'Ordre" doivent respecter une discipline qui rappelle celle des Esséniens: ils doivent être tempérants, ne pas rire, ne pas s'enduire d'huiles parfumées, à comparer avec *La Règle de la Communauté*, 5, 4; 7, 14-15; et Flavius Josèphe, *La guerre des Juifs* paragraphe 123, traduit par Dupont-Sommer, 1959, 5e édition, 38.

Dupont-Sommer 1953: A. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris, 1953.

Dupont-Sommer – Philonenko 1999: A. Dupont-Sommer – M. Philonenko, *Les écrits intertestamentaires*, Paris, 1999.

Funk-Bihlmeyer-Whittaker, 1992: F.X. Funk – K. Bihlmeyer – M. Whittaker, *Die Apostolischen Väter, Griechisch-deutsch Parallelausgabe*, Tübingen, 1992.

Haas 1992: C. Haas, "Die Pneumatologie des *Hirten des Hermas*", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 27, 1, 1992, p. 552-586.

Hadot, 1970: J. Hadot, *Penchant mauvais et volonté libre dans la sagesse de Ben Sira (L'Ecclésiastique)*, Bruxelles, 1970.

Hollander – De Jonge, 1985: H.W. Hollander – M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Leyde, 1985.

Jargy, 1951: S. Jargy, "Les "fils et filles du Pacte" dans la littérature monastique syriaque", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 17, 1951, p. 304-320.

Joly, 1953: R. Joly, "Judaïsme, christianisme et hellénisme dans le *Pasteur d'Hermas*", *La Nouvelle Clio*, 1953, p. 394-406.

——— 1986: *Hermas, Le Pasteur*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, 2e édition, Paris, 1986.

——— 1992: "Le milieu complexe du *Pasteur d'Hermas*" *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 27, 1, 1992, p. 524-551.

Kedar-Kopfstein, 1986: B. Kedar-Kopfstein, article "*'edaen*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 5, Stuttgart, 1986, p. 1093-1103.

Leutzsch, 1989: M. Leutzsch, *Dier Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas"*, Göttingen, 1989.

Lluis-Font, 1963: P. Lluis-Font, "Sources de la doctrine d'Hermas sur les deux Esprits", *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, 1963, p. 83-98.

Lutzmann – Geraty – Ringgren – Mitchel, 1982: H. Lutzmann – L.T. Geraty – H. Ringgren – L. Mitchel, article "*hasak*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 3, Stuttgart, 1982, p. 261-277.

Philonenko, 1971: M. Philonenko, "L'âme à l'étroit", *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, Paris 1971, p. 421-427.

——— 1987: "De l'habitation des deux Esprits en nous", *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1987, p.388-400.

——— 1998: "Aimer la vérité et haïr le mensonge (histoire d'une formule)", *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, séance du 29 mai 1998, à paraître.

Pierre, 1988-1989: M.J. Pierre, *Aphraate, le Sage Persan, les Exposés*, traduction du syriaque, introduction et notes, 2 volumes, Paris 1988-1989.

Prigent – Kraft, 1971: P. Prigent – R.A. Kraft, *Epître de Barnabé*, Paris, 1971.

Reitzenstein 1904, R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-aegyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1904.

Rordorf-Tuilier, 1978: W. Rordorf – A. Tuilier, *La doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)*, Paris, 1978.

Seitz, 1959-1960: O.J.F. Seitz, "Two Spirits in a man. An Essay in Biblical Exegesis", *New Testament Studies*, 1959-1960, p. 82-95.

Seybold, 1984: K. Seybold, article "*la'anah*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 4, Stuttgart, 1984, p. 586-588.

Taylor, 1893: C. Taylor, "The Two Ways in Hermas and Xenophon", *Journal of Philology* 21, 1893, p. 243-559.

Tengström-Fabry, 1993: S. Tengström – H.J. Fabry, "*(ruah)*", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 7, Stuttgart, 1993, p. 385-425.

Van der Elst, 1914: R. Van der Elst, *Galien, Le traité des passions de l'âme*, Paris, 1914.

VanderKam, 1996: J. VanderKam, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, 22, Oxford, 1996.

Vööbus, 1988: A. Vööbus, *A History of Ascetism in the Syrian Orient*, III, Louvain, 1988.

Whittaker, 1967: M. Whittaker, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Die Apostolischen Väter I, Berlin, 1967.

Widengren – Hultgård – Philonenko, 1995: G. Widengren – A. Hultgård – M. Philonenko, *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien*, Paris, 1995.

Wilson, 1993: C. Wilson, *Toward a reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, New York, 1993.

67000 *Strasbourg*, 36 rue Geiler

"MANY LAMPS ARE LIGHTENED FROM THE ONE": PARADIGMS OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL VISION IN MACARIAN HOMILIES

BY

ANDREI ORLOV AND ALEXANDER GOLITZIN

Among mystical testimonies circulating in the Eastern Christian tradition, two portentous descriptions of transformational visions can be found.

The first account is drawn from *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE and preserved in the Eastern Christian environment in its Slavonic translation. In this text the prediluvian patriarch Enoch describes his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory:

> And Michael, the Lord's greatest archangel, lifted me up and brought me in front of the face of the Lord . . . And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil; and the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun. And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[1]

The second account is written a thousand years later and comes from *Philokalia*, a collection of Eastern Christian writings compiled by Nicodemus Hagioretes, in which Pseudo-Symeon conveys preparatory instructions for acquiring the vision of the Taboric light:

> Then sit down in a quite cell, in corner by yourself, and do what I tell you. Close the door, and withdraw your intellect from everything worthless and transient. Rest your beard on your chest, and focus your physical gaze, together with the whole of your intellect, upon the centre of your belly or your navel. Restrain the drawing-in of breath through your nostrils, so as not to breathe easily, and search inside yourself with your intellect so as to find the place of

[1] *2 Enoch* 22:6-10. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 139.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

> the heart, where all the powers of the soul reside. To start with you will find there darkness and an impenetrable density. Later, when you persist and practice this task day and night, you will find, as though miraculously, an unceasing joy. For as soon as the intellect attains the place of the heart, at once it sees things of which it previously knew nothing. It sees the open space within the heart and it beholds itself entirely luminous and full of discrimination.[2]

It is apparent that these two descriptions belong to very different symbolic worlds. In the first one, an adept, on his celestial trip, finds himself before the glorious appearance of the Lord, accompanied by the angels who extract the visitor from his earthly garments and anoint him with delightful oil. In the second one, he is led through darkness and "an impenetrable density" on the inner journey to the depth of his heart. The majesty of the celestial environment strikingly confronts the monotonous quietness of the inner contemplation. Still, something similar is recognizable in these two accounts. In both descriptions the visionaries eventually come to the same result—they behold themselves luminescent. Both accounts also stress the totality of this metamorphosis—mystical adepts of these visions become "entirely" luminous. It is, however, observable that in the two accounts the source of the divine light is different. In the first account, it comes from outside, namely from the glorious appearance of the Lord, depicted symbolically as the angelic anointing with shining oil. The shining oil, the "covering" substance of the transformation, serves as an additional detail which stresses the outer nature of the visionary's luminous metamorphosis.

The important feature of the second account which differentiates it from the first is the "inner" nature of the luminous metamorphosis—the illumination comes from inside, from the darkness of the soul, proceeding from the open space within the heart of the visionary.

Separated by a millennium, these two accounts serve as significant marks of the long-lasting theological journey from the outer transformational vision to its inner counterpart. On this journey the towering figure of the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius, remains prominent. The purpose of this article is to explore some of his concepts which in our opinion play a formative role in the transition from outer to inner in the transformational visions of Eastern Christian tradition.

---

[2] Pseudo-Simeon, "The Three Methods of Prayer," in: *The Philokalia* (5 vols.; tr. G.E.H. Palmer, P. Sherrard, and K. Ware; London: Faber and Faber, 1995) 4.72-3.

The Background: Transformational Vision of the Kabod

In order to clarify the differences between the two transformational visions mentioned earlier, we must return now to the initial theological contexts which lie behind these two accounts.

The origin of the *Kabod* paradigm, which is formative for the vision in the Slavonic apocalypse, can be traced to Old Testament materials where one can find various polemics for and against the anthropomorphic understanding of God.[3] Weinfeld observes that the imagery of the enthroned divine glory known to us as the Lord's *Kabod* was "crystallized" in the Priestly and Ezekielian traditions.[4]

Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation.[5] In this tradition, "in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes," God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle.[6]

Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source[7] but derived from early sacral conceptions.[8] In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced

---

[3] On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31-8; J. Hempel, "Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75-85; F. Michaeli, *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancient Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950); W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961) 1.210-20; M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990) 87-590; T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191-209. On late Jewish anthropomorphism see: M. Fishbane, "The 'Measures' of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash," in I. Gruenwald *et al.* (eds.), *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992) 53-74; Arthur Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: Essays in Anthropomorphism* (New York: KTAV, 1937).

[4] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191.

[5] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982) 24.

[6] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191.

[7] For the roots of the theology of the priestly tabernacle see: T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 81-3.

[8] Weinfeld shows that "the notion of God sitting enthroned upon the cherubim was prevalent in ancient Israel (1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; Ps 80:2; 2 Kgs 19:15)." Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 192.

between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark,[9] his footstool.[10]

This motif of the enthroned Deity becomes a central image in the book of Ezekiel, whose *Kabod*[11] theology is similar[12] to the Priestly doctrine.[13] Mettinger observes that "in Ezekiel, the *Kabod*-conception proved to represent an earlier phase than that discovered in the P-materials."[14] He further stresses that the iconography of Ezekiel is closely connected with the idea of God's royal presence in his sanctuary.[15] This connection of the *Kevod YHWH* with the enthroned God can scarcely be divorced from its previously established usage in early royal contexts.[16]

Weinfeld notes that Ezekiel's persistent tendency to describe God's *Kabod* as a brilliant and radiant fire encased in a cloud is also a distinct characteristic of the Priestly writings.[17] He argues that in the Priestly and

---

[9] Mettinger stresses that "the most important aspect of the Ark in Solomon's Temple was that it served as the footstool of God." T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 87.

[10] M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim," *IEJ* 9 (1959) 30-8.

[11] The term *Kabod* (Heb. *kbwd*) occurs 199 times in the OT (24 occurrences in the Pentateuch, 7 in the Deuteronomistic history, 18 in the Chronicler's history, 38 in Isaiah, 19 in Ezekiel, occasionaly in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets, 51 occurrences in the Psalms and 16 in Proverbs). The term *kbwd* can be translated as "substance," "body," "mass," "power," "might," "honor," "glory," "splendor." In its meaning as "glory" *Kabod* usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearences in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe *Kabod* as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, "*kbwd*" *TDOT*, 7.22-38.

[12] It is also noteworthy that Ezekiel and the materials of the Priestly tradition, such as Gen 5:1, share similar terminology, namely the term *dmwt*. The term *dmwt* appears 12 times in the Book of Ezekiel where it becomes a favorite terminology for the description of various divine and angelic "appearances." It occupies a prominent place in Biblical anthropomorphic debates. Both terms *kbwd* and *dmwt* are intimately connected through the notion of "hiddeness" of the Divine form/glory. Later Jewish *Shiur Qomah* traditions stress the aspect of the hiddeness of *dmwt*: "His *dmwt* is hidden from everyone, but no one's *dmwt* is hidden from Him." M.S. Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983) 113. For a fuller discussion see A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 102-4.

[13] On the connections between P and Ezekiel see B. Stein, *Der Begriff "Kebod Jahweh"* (Emsdetten; Lechte, 1939) 299. See also T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 107-11.

[14] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 116-17.

[15] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

[16] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

[17] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 201.

Ezekielian writings the fire and cloud are inseparable elements of the apparition of God's Glory, where the cloud is the divine envelope which screens the Deity from mortal view.[18] In later Jewish and Christian traditions the radiant luminosity emitted by various celestial beings fulfills the same function, protecting against the direct vision of their true forms. In the Hebrew Bible, as well as in later apocalyptic traditions, God's "form" remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kabod* is revealed through its light.[19] This situation explains the wide use of the *Kabod* paradigm in the visions of light phenomena.

Kabod theology leads to the special type of transformational visions that can be found in various biblical and apocalyptic materials.[20] In the climactic points of these accounts, their visionaries normally "see" the extend of the divine glory, often portrayed as enthroned anthropomorphic figure. As a consequence of this encounter, the visionary experiences a dramatic external metamorphosis which often affects his face, limbs, and garments, making them luminescent. A classic example of such a transformational vision is the account of Moses' shining countenance in Ex 34 after his encounter with the Lord's *Kabod* on Mount Sinai. It is noteworthy that in the apocalyptic and Merkabah traditions the vision of the Lord's Glory ("the King in His beauty") increasingly becomes the main teleological point of the heavenly ascents.

Enoch's transformation in the Slavonic apocalypse also belongs to the *Kabod* paradigm. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis took place in the front of the Lord's glorious "extent," labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's "Face."[21]

---

[18] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 202.

[19] De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104-5. De Conick's research investigates the relationships between God's form and God's light, showing their complexity. She argues that in some traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kabod* is revealed through its light. "The visionary can only gain access to a vision of the deity through the deity's light." De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104-5.

[20] G. Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980) 1-13.

[21] "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord" (*2 Enoch* 22:1-4, the longer recension). Andersen, 136.

From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine "Face" had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. A significant detail in this description is that Enoch is not transformed into light but covered, "clothed," with the light of God's Glory. The use of delightful oil as a covering substance emphasizes this "covering nature" of the luminous metamorphosis.

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine face, an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with that of Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face in the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, "just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun . . ."[22] Right after this "chilling procedure," the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at his face.[23] This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.

In spite of the dominant role of the *Kabod* pattern in biblical and apocalyptic theophanic accounts, it becomes increasingly challenged in the postbiblical rabbinic[24] and patristic environments which offered new under-

---

[22] Andersen, 160.

[23] Andersen, 160.

[24] It becomes especially notable in Hekhaloth mysticism, where the teleology of the mystical journeys came to be expressed in terms of descent into the Merkabah. On Merkabah and Hekhaloth mysticism see: P. Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 156-80; D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism, a Source Reader: The Merkabah tradition and the Zoharic tradition* (New York: KTAV, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) xi-xlvii; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980); Gruenwald, I. and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); D. Halperin, *The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220-40; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany:

standings of the transformational vision. In these new developments, one can see a growing emphasis on the interiorization of the visionary experience.[25] Among the new notions employed for the purposes of such a paradigm shift was the prominent biblical concept of the image of God after which Adam was created.

In the Likeness of God's Image

Gilles Quispel in his book *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*[26] draws the reader's attention to an interesting tradition preserved in Homily II.12[27] of Pseudo-Macarius. From the homily we learn that

---

State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); C. Morray-Jones, "Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic Tradition; Alexander's Three Test Cases," *JJS* 22 (1991) 1-39; C. Newsom, *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86; P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); P. Schäfer *et al.*, *Übersetzung der Hekhaloth-Literatur* (4 vols.; TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Siebeck, 1987-95); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); N. Séd, "Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zakkai," *RHR* 184 (1973) 49-66; M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Maaseh Merkavah* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).

[25] On the issue of the interiorization of transformational visions see: A. Golitzin, "Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity," *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1999) 159-86; Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), "Forma lui Dumnezeu si Vedera Slavei. Reflectii Asupra Contraversei Antropomorfite Din Anul 399 D. Hr.," in: Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), *Mistagogia. Experienta lui Dumnezeu în Ortodoxie* (Sibiu: Deisis, 1998) 184-267; N. Séd, "La shekinta et ses amis araméens," *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* XX (1988) 133-42.

[26] G. Quispel, *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle* (SNT, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 57-8.

[27] There are four Byzantine medieval collections of Macarian Homilies. Three of them appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)* (2 vols.; ed. H. Bertold, GCS; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1973). Collection II appeared in: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964). Collection III appeared in *Neue Homilien des Makarios/Simeon aus Typus III* (eds. E. Klostermann and H. Berthold; TU, 72; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961) and *Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homelies propres a la Collection III* (ed. V. Desprez; SC, 275; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980). In our references to the Macarian homilies the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate the Collection, following arabic numerals will designate the specific homily and its subsections.

"Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance" (II.12.1).[28] Further, another important passage in the homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God's glory in place of clothing (περιβολαίου) (II.12.8).[29] The text reveals a certain continuity between Adam's "very image itself" and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam's nature, created according to the image and likeness of God[30] and Adam's "very image (εἰκόνα) itself," speaking about them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author's familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about *tselem* (Heb. ṣlm) of Adam—the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.[31]

The term "image" (Gk. εἰκών) can be found in a number of significant New Testament passages. The most important of them for the purposes of the current investigation is the Pauline description of Christ as the "image of the invisible God" in Col 1:15, which has often been compared to the account of the creation of Adam and seen as part of Paul's Adam

---

[28] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* (tr. G.A. Maloney, S.J.; New York: Paulist Press, 1992) 97. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964) 107-8.

[29] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 100.

[30] It is important that Genesis 1:26 stresses that Adam's *ṣlm* was created after God's own *ṣlm*, being some sort of luminous "imitation" of the glorious *ṣlm* of God. Some scholars even argue that "in this way, the likeness that Adam and God shared is not physicality—in the normal sense of having a body—but luminescence." David Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body," 303.

[31] For discussions about the luminous garment/image/body of Adam see: David H. Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *HTR* 90 (1997) 299-314; S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982) 11-40; A.D. De Conick and J. Fossum, "Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas," *VC* 45 (1991) 141; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955) 5.97; Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 171-95; B. Murmelstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255; W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1938) 11.

Christology.[32] This theological connection between Adam's creation after the image of God and Christ as the image of God has opened several possibilities for using ancient aggadic traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam in new Christian theophanic contexts. In Pauline writings we can also see peculiar terminological parallels in which the notion of image (εἰκών) becomes closely associated with such important theophanic concepts, prominent in traditional *Kabod* theology, as glory[33] (δόξα)[34] and form (μορφή).[35]

Other important theological developments in Gnostic[36] and rabbinic circles lead to a gradual "interiorization" of the *tselem* imagery. In postbiblical Jewish accounts, *tselem* is often identified with the luminous "clothing" of the human heart. Scholem's research shows that in Jewish mysticism *tselem* was also understood as a sort of "garment" of the soul, which "floats" over it. He observes that "this garment also becomes the soul's heavenly

---

[32] J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 15. Cf. also: A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie der Apostel* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1922) 299; M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT* 7 (1954) 174-9; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 97-9.

[33] See for example 2 Cor 4:4: ". . . the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God . . ."

[34] H.A.W. Meyer, J. Weiss and J. Behm understand Paul's concept of μορφή as the divine Glory (δόξα), believing that "in Pauline sense, Christ was from the beginning no other than *kbwd*, δόξα of God himself, the glory and radiation of his being, which appears almost as an independent hypostasis of God and yet is connected intimately with God." See R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967) 104-5. One of the major exponents of the hypothesis, J. Behm, in Kittel's *TDNT*, argues that the statement in Phillipians 2:6 about the form of God corresponds closely with the statement in John 17:5 about the glory which "I had with Thee before the world was." *TDNT*, 4.751.

[35] Biblical scholars argue that μορφή and εἰκών are used as interchangeable terms in the LXX and in Paul. For example, an investigation of the Old Testament's connection between terms *ṣlm* and *dmwt* in the light of their translation in the LXX as μορφή lead scholars to believe that "μορφή in Philippians 2:6 is immediately related to the concept εἰκών, since the Semitic root word *ṣlm* can correspond to either of the two Greek words." R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967) 108. For the discussion of the body/image of Christ in Pauline thought see Jarl Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

[36] J. Fossum observes that in some Gnostic circles "'the shining,' 'image,' or 'likeness' of God, after which the body of the earthly man was fashioned appears as a separate entity, even some form of hypostasis." Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 16.

attire when it returns to Paradise after death."[37] This Jewish idea of the "inner" luminous *tselem* might well be already known in Christian circles, particularly in the Syriac environment.

It is also possible that Ephraem, Macarius, and some other Syrian Christian writers might have acquired the notion of the luminous human *tselem* through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, which attest to traditions about the original luminosity of Adam and Eve.[38]

It is noticeable that in the Macarian homilies and other Eastern Christian writings the notion of luminous *tselem* became gradually employed for the purposes of the internalized beatific vision. *Tselem* became utilized as a sort of theological counterpart to the classic concept of the divine *Kabod* which traditionally played a prominent role in Biblical and apocalyptic visions. Sometimes both imageries were used interchangeably.

In the patristic environment the concept of the image of God gradually became a "safer" way to convey visionary experiences of the light phenomena, especially after the anthropomorphite controversy of 399 CE,[39] when antianthropomorpic polemics[40] made it increasingly difficult to employ the traditional "anthropomorphic" language of beatific visions, including the classical *Kabod* imagery.[41] By the fourth century in patristic trinitarian

---

[37] Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976) 264.

[38] Cf. S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982) 11-40.

[39] On the anthropomorphite controversy see: Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Graham Gould, "The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 549-57.

[40] On antianthropomorphic polemics see: Elizabeth A. Clark, "New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies," *Church History* 59 (1990) 145-62; Lawrence Hennessey, "A Philosophical Issue of Origen's Eschatology: The Three Senses of Incorporeality," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 373-80; John A. McGuckin, "The Changing Forms of Jesus," in Lothar Lies (ed.), *Origeniana Quarta* (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien, Bd. 19; Innsbruck; Wien: Tyrola-Verlag, 1987) 215-222; David L. Paulsen, "Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses," *HTR* 83:2 (1990) 105-16; Gedaliahu Stroumsa, "The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position," *Religion* (1983) 345-58.

[41] Similar antropomorphic developments are also noticeable in postbiblical Jewish

debates about the divine light the *Kabod* terminology was almost completely substituted by the symbolism of the divine image.

A thousand years later, in Hesychast transformational visions of the Taboric light, the concept of the image of God still continued to play a crucial theological role. It is especially noticeable in Gregory Palamas' theology of the divine image which shows amazing parallels to the concepts and imagery of Macarius. Among them is an open employment of the Adamic *Gestalt*. Palamas, following Macarius, draws heavily on ancient traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam. In *One Hundred and Fifty Texts*, he argues that "Adam, before the fall, also participated in this divine illumination and resplendence, and because he was truly clothed in a garment of glory he was not naked, nor was he unseemly by reason of his

---

mysticism, with its gradual elaboration of the *ṣlm* concept. In Jewish tradition *ṣlm* played an important role in anthropomorphic developments. It was understood not simply as an abstract likeness but had a strong "corporeal meaning." See Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 174. See also: Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976) 251-73. Gottstein's research deals with a number of rabbinic texts that reveal this "corporeal" understanding of *ṣlm*. He argues that in some instances it is interchangeable with other Hebrew terms for the designation of "body," like the term *dmwt*. Speaking about these corporeal meanings of *ṣlm* Gottstein notes that ". . . Adam's *tselem* is his luminous body. In other sources, such as the story of Hillel washing his body [*Lev. R.* 34.3], the *tselem* referred to the physical body. *Tselem* can be thus refer to various levels, or aspects, all of which bear a resemblance to the physical body. I would propose that these various levels, or various bodies, reflect one another. The physical body is a reflection of the body of light. This reflection may translate itself down to the details of circumcision. The kind of graded devolutionary process that we encountered above may be a model for two ways of talking about *tselem*. The *tselem* in its original form may be lost, but the dimmer reflection of this form is extant in the physical body, which may still be spoken of as *tselem*." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 188. Rabbinic literature gives a number of references to traditions about the luminosity of the original *tselem* of Adam. One of them can be found in *Lev. R.* 20.2. in which "Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the brightness of his face! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 4. 252. Another important passage which can be found in *Gen. R.* 20.12 tells us that the scroll of Rabbi Meir reads "garments of light" instead of "garments of skin," stressing thus that Adam has not lost completely his luminous quality even after the Fall: "In R. Meir's Torah it was found written, 'Garments of light (or)': this refers to Adam's garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 1. 171.

nakedness."[42] The Syrian background of Palamas' speculation about Adam is evident.[43] Recognizing the tragic consequences which Adam's fall had for the condition of the human *tselem*,[44] he reaffirms its irrevocable value for the inner transformational vision: "Leaving aside other matters for the present, I shall simply say that perfection of the divine likeness is accomplished by means of the divine illumination that issues from God."[45]

The theme of regaining this lost luminous image of God, "the dimmer reflection," which is still mysteriously extant in the human physical body (sometimes in the form of a luminous "clothing" of the heart) and can be eventually "restored," had a number of interesting theological ramifications in the Hesychast tradition.[46] The Hesychast idea of the light-like (φωτοειδές) sensitive nature of man[47] shows clear similarities with this early Syrian understanding of the luminous *tselem* as a reflection of God's Glory.

Internalization of the Kabod

It was mentioned earlier that in some biblical accounts the figure of Moses is often connected with *Kabod* theology.[48] This tendency is traceable both in the Old Testament Exodus stories and in New Testament accounts of Christ's Transfiguration where Moses serves as a significant "theophanic" reminder. In postbiblical Jewish and Christian writings the Moses *Gestalt*, however, gradually became utilized for the purposes of internalized visions. It cannot be a coincidence that in these new theological "developments," the Moses account was also linked with the *tselem* imagery.

---

[42] *Philokalia*, 4.377.

[43] An aggadic tradition, which survived in the Syriac environment, explains why Adam and Eve discovered their nakedness only after the Fall. According to the tradition, it happened because after their transgression they lost their original radiance—the "garments of light" which prevented them from seeing their naked "physical" bodies. Luminosity thus served for the prelapsarian humankind as a sort of screen which concealed their original form. Gregory Palamas clearly employs this tradition.

[44] "Even though we still bear God's image to a greater degree than the angels, yet as regards the likeness of God we fall far short of them." *Philokalia*, 4.376.

[45] *Philokalia*, 4.376.

[46] Cf. John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 6 (1960-61) 186-205 and *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963-64) 225-70.

[47] See John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963-64) 235.

[48] On Moses' connection with *Kabod* theology see: A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 39; Atlanta: Scholars, 2000) 130-47.

These tendencies are noticeable in the Macarian Homilies where Moses is often portrayed as Adam's luminous counterpart. Following the already mentioned Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells us how Adam lost his luminous status and "obeyed his darker side," Macarius gives us Moses' example who "had a glory shining on his countenance." The homily refers to Moses' Sinai experience, expanding this tradition and adding some new significant details:

> Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σκεπάζεται) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food (II.12.14).[49]

It is noticeable that the passage serves as a bridge between the symbolic worlds of the *Kabod* and *tselem*. Macarius openly "internalizes" the Moses account, stressing that Moses' glory now "shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians." On the other hand, some features of the Kabod's paradigm are still noticeable: the homilist understands Moses' luminosity as a covering with God's glory.[50] The author's further discussion in II.12.15 about the clothing of Christians and wrapping them in "divine and glorious garments" gives additional strength to this motif of Moses, covered with the luminous garments of God's glory.

The tendencies for internalizing the *Kabod* paradigm through implications of the concept of God's image found in Macarian Homilies demonstrate amazing similarities to some Jewish developments. The late Rabbinic midrashim attest to such traditions.[51] The origin of such theological innovations can be found in its rudimentary form already in some Jewish apocalypses, notably in *2 Enoch* from which we learn that the Lord created

---

[49] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 102. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 114.

[50] The motif of covering with the Glory is also prominent in another Macarian passage which depicts Moses' shining countenance: "For blessed Moses provided us with a certain type through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze (II.15.10)." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 74.

[51] In Rabbinic literature the traditions about Moses as a luminous conterpart of Adam also can be found. Gottstein stresses that "the luminescent quality of the *tselem* is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 182. *Deut. R.* 11.3 attests to such traditions: "Adam said to Moses: 'I am greater than you because

Adam after His face. F. Andersen stresses the theological uniqueness of such creational imagery. He, however, does not clarify what the creation after the Lord's face means in the broader textual context of the Slavonic apocalypse. The Lord's face plays an important role in *2 Enoch's* theophanic descriptions being identified with the Lord's glorious form—His *Kabod*. In chapter 22 of *2 Enoch* the Lord's face emits light and fire and serves as the source of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis. In this context, the creation of Adam after the Lord's Face demonstrates a remarkable effort toward merging the *Kabod* and *tselem* paradigms of the transformational vision.

The previous investigation shows the important role of Adam/Moses connection in the evolution from outer to inner in *Kabod* imagery. It is clear, however, that in the Macarian writings the internalizing of the *Kabod* paradigm is not confined solely to the reevaluation of Moses' *Gestalt*. The effort is much more radical. In fact, it is so revolutionary, that it strikes even distinguished students of the mystical traditions. One of them, Gershom Scholem, points to the amazing Macarian tendency for mystical "reinterpretation" of the Merkabah vision of Ezekiel in which the human soul becomes itself the throne of glory.[52] In Homily II.1.1-2 Macarius writes:

> When Ezekiel the prophet beheld the divinely glorious vision, he described it in human terms but in a way full of mysteries that completely surpass the powers of the human mind . . . And all of this which the prophet saw in ecstasy or in a trance was indeed true and certain, but it was only signifying and foreshadowing something no less hidden, something divine and mysterious, "a mystery hidden for generations" (Col 1:26) but that "has been revealed only in our time, the end of the ages," (1 Pt 1:20) when Christ appeared. For the prophet was viewing the mystery of the human soul that would receive its Lord and would become his throne of glory. For the soul that is deemed to

---

I have been created in the image of God.' Whence this? For it is said, 'and God created man in his own image' (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: 'I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me.' Whence? For it is said: 'his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated' (Deut. 34,7)." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 7. 173. Gottstein also gives another midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4 in which Moses is again Adam's luminous counterpart: "In the likeness of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt . . . In the beginning: 'and God created man in his image,' and in the desert: 'and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone.'" Cf. Adolph Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1967) 3. 168.

[52] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schoken, 1961) 79.

> be judged worthy to participate in the light of the Holy Spirit by becoming his throne and habitation, and is covered with the beauty of ineffable glory of the Spirit, becomes all light, all face, all eye.[53]

Scholem, observing such a radical rethinking of classic *Kabod* imagery, further asks the legitimate question: "was there not a temptation to regard man himself as the representative of divinity, his soul as the throne of glory?"[54] Interestingly enough, this query directs us to the very heart of the Macarian theological enterprise in which the *Kabod* internalization become possible only as a consequence of the unique interrelationships between human and divine in the event of Christ's transfiguration.

Crystallization of the New Paradigm: The Macarian Account of the Lord's Transfiguration

The previous analysis shows that in the Macarian homilies Moses' shining countenance and the luminosity of Adam's prelapsarian *tselem* serve as metaphors for major paradigms of the transformational vision.

In the Macarian writings, one can also encounter a third paradigm of luminous transformation which is radically different from the previous two traditions. In a peculiar Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration[55] on Mt. Tabor, the duality of inner and outer in *visio Dei* is attempted through in a new metaphor of the transformational vision—Christ's "Body[56] of Light."[57]

---

[53] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

[54] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schoken, 1961) 79.

[55] The original Synoptic accounts of Christ's transfiguration seem influenced by the *Kabod* paradigm in its classical Exodus' form. Several details of the account serve as important reminders: the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration see: J.A. McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 9; Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986) 1-19; J. Markus, *The Way of the Lord* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992) 80-93; M.E. Thrall, "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration," *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 305-17.

[56] The verb from the Synoptic account implies that Jesus' body was changed. Cf. J. Behm, *TDNT*, 4.755-7.

[57] Another important testimony to the Lord's Body of Light is *Pseudo-Clementine Homily* 17.7 which pictures the brilliant radiance of Christ's body in connection with Christ's image: "For He has shape, and He has every limb primarily and solely for beauty's sake, and not for use. For He has not eyes that He may see with them; for He sees on every side, since He is incomparably more brilliant in His body than the visual spirit

Macarius makes an important theological statement when he observes that in His Transfiguration Christ was not just covered by the Glory but "was transfigured into (μετεμορφώθη εἰς) divine glory and into infinite light (εἰς τὸ φῶς τὸ ἄπειρον)" (II.15.38).[58]

In II.15.38 the homilist elaborates this ingenious understanding of Christ's transfiguration in which the internal and external aspects of transformational mystical experience are absolutely resolved:

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning.[59] Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies . . . (II.15.38).[60]

The language of the passage further reinforces the totality of this transformational vision—Christ's internal glory serves as the teleological source of his complete, luminous metamorphosis.

In the articulation of the newness of Christ's condition, Macarius thus offers a completely new paradigm of the beatific vision—the bodies of visionaries are now not simply covered externally with the divine light but are "lightened"[61] in the way as many lamps are lightened from the one:

---

which is in us, and He is more splendid than everything, so that in comparison with Him the light of the sun may be reckoned as darkness. Nor has He ears that He may hear; for He hears, perceives, moves, energizes, acts on every side. But He has the most beautiful shape on account of man, that the pure in heart may be able to see Him, that they may rejoice because they suffered. For He molded man in His own shape as in the grandest seal, in order that he may be the ruler and lord of all, and that all may be subject to him. Wherefore, judging that He is the universe, and that man is His image (for He is Himself invisible, but His image man is visible), the man who wishes to worship Him honours His visible image, which is man." A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950-51) 8. 319-20. It is important that here Christ's luminosity is placed into the account of Adam's creation after God's image. The phrase "He is incomparably more brilliant in his body than the visual spirit which is in us" deserves particular attention since it can refer to the correspondence between the Lord's luminous "body" and the Adamic *tselem*.

[58] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

[59] Origen in *Princ.* 2.3.7 remarks that the best and purest spirits must have some kind of body, being changed according to their degree of merit into an ethereal condition, and interprets "change" in 1 Cor 15:52 as "shining with light."

[60] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

[61] It is noteworthy that the homilist applies the imagery of "covering" not only to the physical bodies of these Christians but also to their souls which according to him

> Similarly, as many lamps are lighted from the one, same fire, so also it is necessary that the bodies of the saints, which are members of Christ, become the same which Christ himself is (II.15.38).[62]

In this new concept of the transformational vision, Macarius, however, sets a significant distinction between Christ's Transfiguration and human luminous transformation. In contrast to the Lord's metamorphosis, the bodies of mortals cannot be completely "transfigured into the divine glory" but rather simply become "glorified."

The hypostatic quality of Christ's luminous form is what differentiates Him from transformed Christians who are only predestined to participate in the light of His Glory and "have put on the raiment of ineffable light."[63] This articulation of the distinction between Christ's hypostasis and His light will play later an important role in Palamas' dialectics of God's essence and the divine energies.

Conclusion

It is time to return to the passage from the *Philokalia* which began this investigation. In comparison with the "traditional" cases of transformational visions, this account might look quite ambiguous. It demonstrates the absence of significant details of such visions in which the luminous metamorphosis of a visionary becomes possible as the consequence of the beatific vision of the glorious "form" of the Deity. The teleological necessity of such a divine form, in its external or internal manifestations, seems to presuppose the very possibility of any luminous metamorphosis. On the contrary, in the *Philokalia* account a visionary does not see any luminous form, but "the open space within the heart," which, however, makes him entirely luminous.

The answer to this strange situation can be found in the Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration on Mount Tabor which plays a paradigmatic role in later Hesychastic visions of the divine light. Macarius' position implies that Christ in the Tabor story represents both aspects of the transformational vision. First, He is the Glory after which a visionary

---

will be "covered with the beauty of the ineffable glory of the light of Christ." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

[62] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

[63] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 44.

is transformed. Second, He is also the visionary himself, whose face and garments[64] are transformed. In the Macarian writings Christ's interior glory is poured out upon his external body, making it luminous.

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning. Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies . . . (II.15.38).[65]

In the light of the Macarian account of Christ's transfiguration, the requirement for the divine glorious form as the transforming source of the visionary experience becomes substituted by the notion of the divine energies. It becomes possible since the locus of the visionary's perspective now is not external to the divine luminous form, but is rather immanent within it. In this situation the dichotomy between the subject of the beautific vision and the object of the beautific vision can be easily overcome.

A Hesychast in his transformational vision intends to resemble Christ in the Transfiguration. He focuses his physical and intellectual gaze not on the outside but on the inside, upon his heart, "where all the powers of the soul reside," waiting patiently that the interior power of Christ will lighten him as a lamp, so he can "become the same which Christ himself is." Divine glory here, just as in the *Kabod* tradition, is still confined within the anthropomorphic form, but there is a substantial difference—this human form is now the visionary himself, who imitates Christ's transfiguration, whose inner glory pours out exteriorly upon the body.

Marquette University, Milwaukee WI 53233

---

[64] The luminous face and the transformed garments of Christ in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration may stress the role of Christ as a visionary of His own glory. It parallels the shining face of Moses after his visionary experience on Mount Sinai and to the transformation of visionaries' garments in Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

[65] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

THE SONG OF SONGS AND THE ASCENT OF THE SOUL: AMBROSE, AUGUSTINE, AND THE LANGUAGE OF MYSTICISM

BY

F. B. A. ASIEDU

I. *Augustine, Ambrose, and Allegorical Exegesis*

By his own testimony, Augustine was introduced to the allegorical interpretation of scripture by Ambrose of Milan. Augustine learned that the Old Testament could be interpreted in a figurative or allegorical sense in such a way that what Augustine had previously thought problematic and uncouth could now be read in a salutary way.[1] Ambrose's practice made patent a hermeneutical style that Augustine would adopt in his own work as a teacher and preacher of scripture. In its broad outlines Augustine's indebtedness to Ambrose is unquestionable. What is not always clear is how much Augustine followed Ambrose in his exegesis and interpretation of particular texts or books of scripture.[2] The Song of Songs offers an interesting case, for a number of reasons.

Perhaps no other work in the scriptures captured the allegorical imagination of early Christian thinkers as the Song of Songs. And none of the allegorical interpretations of biblical texts lent themselves to mystical thought as those centered on the Song of Songs. What is more, the Christian interpretative tradition that developed the line of thought on the Song of Songs as a description of the soul's embrace of God under the figure of a wedding song was shaped in an ascetic context. The ascetic renunciation that characterized Augustine's conversion in the Milanese garden in 386 would have made the allegorical-mystical appropriations of the Song apposite, if Augustine had been so inclined. The earliest literary remains of the allegorical, mystical interpretation of the Song occurs in Origen. The

---

[1] *Confessiones* 6.4.6; 6.5.8; *De utilitate credendi* 3.5-9.

[2] I leave out of consideration here Augustine's invocation of Ambrose's authority in his later works, which belongs to the theme of Augustine's appropriation of antecedent Christian tradition in the context of the Pelagian controversy.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

surviving evidence from Origen's ostensibly detailed and voluminous work on the Song consist of two homilies and a commentary which is a fragment of a much larger work.[3] In his prologue to his commentary, Origen proposes two distinct but complementary approaches to the Song: either we take the beloved as the soul of the bridegroom made in the image of the Word of God, or as the Church which the Word has redeemed, or both. These two become the standard approaches within the tradition.[4]

Ambrose of Milan borrows heavily from Origen, sometimes even to the examples Ambrose adopts in the course of his exegesis.[5] Ambrose often adapts the erotic imagery of the Song to describe the individual soul's ascent to God. His use of eros symbolism in speaking about the ascent of the soul to the divine and the union of the soul with God borrows also from certain Platonic and Neoplatonic themes with which Augustine was conversant. Augustine, after all, received his Neoplatonic apprenticeship in philosophy in Milan some time after learning from Ambrose how biblical texts could be interpreted allegorically (*Confessions* 6.4.5-6).

In spite of the acknowledged influence of Ambrose on Augustine's scriptural hermeneutics, and in spite of the unquestionably Neoplatonic elements in both Ambrose and Augustine's thought, Augustine rarely if ever uses the erotic symbolism inherent in the allegorical interpretations of the Song of Songs to speak about the union of the soul and God. Although well positioned to inherit this tradition, for reasons that are not entirely obvious, Augustine does not follow Ambrose. Peter Brown seems to suggest that Ambrose may have influenced Augustine's Platonism and mysticism at some point.[6] If Ambrose did, it is not evident in this one area: Ambrose's use of erotic imagery to speak about the soul's embrace of God. There is at least one reason for this. Augustine seems to have thought the use of conjugal or erotic imagery in speaking about the love of God as somehow inappropriate. And so the language of the kiss and

---

[3] Origène, *Homélies sur le Cantique des Cantiques*, introduction, traduction et notes de O. Rousseau, Sources Chrétiennes 37 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1953). Henceforth SC 37. I have adopted the following English translation: *Origen: The Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*. Ancient Christian Writers No. 26 (New York: Newman Press, 1956).

[4] E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) 20-31, 87ff.

[5] See, for example, Bernard McGinn, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism, vol. 1. The Foundations of Mysticism: Origins to the Fifth Century* (New York: Crossroad, 1994) 202-216.

[6] Peter R. L. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) 194.

kissing (*osculari*) that is foregrounding at the opening of the Song of Songs and is so current in Ambrose's preaching hardly appears in Augustine.[7]

Whether or not Augustine had the privilege of hearing Ambrose speak on the Song of Songs is difficult to establish. If Pierre Courcelle is correct, some of the sermons Augustine must have heard during the year leading up to his conversion would have referred to the Song.[8] But even without hearing a fullfledged sermon on the Song, Ambrose alluded enough to the Song of Songs in his various homilies that it would have been difficult for Augustine to listen to Ambrose's sermons for any substantial period of time without being exposed to some of what the bishop of Milan thought about the Song. If Augustine missed any of the allusions to the Song of Songs in Ambrose's sermons, he would still have had one more opportunity during Easter Week 387, when Augustine joined other *competentes* to receive baptism from Ambrose.

II. *Ambrose, the Song of Songs, and the Eros of the Soul*

Ambrose's *De mysteriis* provides evidence of this.[9] *De mysteriis* 7.34 contains a description of what happened to the *competentes*. After receiving baptism, decked in white robes, the *compententes* now recognized as full members of the Catholic church, would receive instruction into the mysteries into which they had been inducted. The *De mysteriis* contains part of the instruction that Ambrose presented to the newly-baptized. Ambrose's instruction appropriates the bridal imagery of the Song of Songs in impressing upon the new converts their betrothal to Christ. Everyone who received baptism from Ambrose would therefore come away with some sense of the importance of the spousal imagery in the Song of Songs for their understanding of the great mysteries of the Catholic church which were now being revealed to them. Augustine would not be an exception. The

---

[7] Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967) 83, following Maria Tajo, Un confronto tra S. Ambrogio e S. Agostino a proposito dell'esegesis del Cantico dei Cantici, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 7 (1961) 127-151.

[8] Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin* (Paris: de Boccard, 1968 [2nd Edition]) 128-138.

[9] For Ambrose's *De mysteriis* I adopt the translation in *Saint Ambrose: Theological and Dogmatic Works*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari, Fathers of the Church vol. 44 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963); and for *De Isaac uel anima* I adopt the translation in *Saint Ambrose: Seven Exegetical Works*, trans. Micheal P. McHugh, Fathers of the Church vol. 65 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1972). Henceforth FC 44 and 65 respectively.

nuptial and arboreal appositions in the Song of Songs would become part of the baptismal experience of Augustine.

The emotional weight of that experience is greatly obscured in the simple words in which Augustine describes them later in *Confessions* 9.6.14: "We were baptized and disquiet about our past life vanished from us." If nothing else, Ambrose's words at the baptismal ceremony would have reminded Augustine of a number of his past experiences. Augustine could easily see in the image of the Church as the bride some similarities between Ambrose's teaching and his own attempts at Cassiciacum, shortly after his conversion, to portray his love of Wisdom as an attempt to lay hold of wisdom in a nuptial embrace.[10] Augustine had replaced his old loves with Christ, the Word of God. Ambrose was to underscore this very theme. The impression on Augustine must have been indelible.

In fact, when Augustine recalls the time immediately after his conversion he seems to use the kind of appositions that Ambrose adopts in *De mysteriis* 7.35ff. In *Confessions* 9.3.3 Augustine writes of the arrow of God's love in suggestive images that could well come out of the Song of Songs (4.9f.) and Ambrose's *De mysteriis*:

> You pierced my heart with the arrow of your love and we carried your words transfixing my innermost being. The examples given by your servants whom you had transformed from black to shining white and from death to life, crowded in upon my thoughts. They burnt away and destroyed my heavy sluggishness, preventing me from being dragged down to low things. They set me on fire with such force that every breath of opposition from any deceitful tongue had the power not to dampen my zeal but to inflame it more.[11]

Speaking of the church in *De mysteriis* 7.35, Ambrose weaves together Song of Songs 1.4 and 8.5 in order to make the point that the newly baptized receive the beauty fitting of the church, the bride, because of the sacrament of faith: from black to white, from unbelief to belief, from lowly humanity to redeemed humanity, from sin to the life of faith through grace. All this, because "I am black but beautiful, O ye daughter of Jerusalem. Black through the frailty of human condition, beautiful through grace."[12] And Christ on seeing his church in pure vestments beholds pure souls washed in the waters of regeneration and says to her "Behold, thou are fair, my love, behold thou art fair, thy eyes are as a dove's." At the same

---

[10] *Soliloquia* 1.13.22.

[11] *Confessiones* 9.3.3. *Saint Augustine: Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) 156.

[12] Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 7.35. FC 44, 17.

time, "God the Word," says Ambrose, "is able to speak to the Church in the passionate language of the lover: Why art thou made beautiful and sweet, O love, in thy delights? Thy stature has become like the palm, and thy breasts as clusters of grapes" (Song of Songs 7.6,7).[13] The Church responds in the words of Song of Songs 8.1,2:

> Who shall give thee to me, my brother, sucking the breasts of my mother? I shall find thee without and shall kiss thee, and no one shall despise me. I shall take hold of thee and bring thee into my mother's house, and into the secret place of her who conceived me. You will teach me there.[14]

The gift of grace leads the Church into the interior mysteries of Christ. Christ is the groom who delights in the beauty of his bride the Church. Throughout much of *De mysteriis* the emphasis is on the ecclesial reading of the Song. However, in the background are vague echoes of the soul's embrace of the divine. The ecclesial reading predominates, but Ambrose assumes an easy translation from the ecclesial reading to the soul's embrace of the divine. So, as the Church, the bride, delights in Christ the groom, the individual soul of the newly baptized is to delight in Christ, the divine. Much of what Ambrose assumes in *De mysteriis* emerges more forcefully in Ambrose's *De Isaac uel anima*, the substance of which Augustine may already have been exposed to before his conversion.[15] What he would hear at baptism would therefore have confirmed what he had heard before under slightly different circumstances.

In *De Isaac uel anima*, Ambrose moves seamlessly from speaking about the Church as the bride of Christ to considerations of the individual soul as the beloved. The Church, like Rebecca, awaits its union with Isaac. So when we read "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth" we are to "think upon the Church, in suspense over many ages at the coming of the Lord, long promised her through the prophets."[16] We are to

> think upon the soul, lifting herself up from the body and rejecting indulgence and fleshly delights and pleasures, and laying aside as well her concern for worldly vanities. For a long time now she has desired to be infused with God's presence and has desired too, that grace of the word of salvation, and has wasted away, because he is coming late, and has been struck down, wounded with love as it were, since she cannot endure his delays.[17]

---

[13] Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 7.39. FC 44, 19.
[14] Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 7.40. Ibid.
[15] Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin* 128-138.
[16] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.8. FC 65, 15.
[17] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.8. FC 65, 15.

Song of Songs 1.2, a passage Augustine never quotes, is linked flawlessly with verse 8 of chapter 5, yet another text which almost never appears in Augustine's references and allusions to the Song, even though Augustine's language of love's wounds and the tardiness of his joy in the *Confessions* all but presuppose this element of delay and languor. Ambrose is unrestrained about the love sickness that frustrates the soul's desire for nuptial embrace.

> Turning to the Father, she [the soul] asks that he send to her God the Word, and giving the reason why she is so impatient, she says, "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth." She asks, not for one kiss, but for many kisses, so that she may fulfill her desire. For as a lover, she is not satisfied with the meager offering of a single kiss, but demands many, claims many as her right, and thus has grown accustomed to recommend herself the more to her beloved.[18]

But the kisses, however many, are a mere prelude to wedded joy. In a remarkably detailed passage, Ambrose explains how much the kiss itself becomes the vehicle for a transmission of the substance of life, as if life passes from one to the other. The soul opens its mouth and pants, says Ambrose, and then expects its life to be revived in the kiss.

> For it is with the kiss that lovers cleave to each other and gain possession of the sweetness of grace that is within, so to speak. Through such a kiss the soul cleaves to God the Word, and through the kiss the spirit of him who kisses is poured into the soul, just as those who kiss are not satisfied to touch lightly with their lips but appear to be pouring their spirit into each other.[19]

Ambrose exploits the image of spousal, conjugal love and extends it to the representation of the soul's wedded embrace of the divine. Ambrose repeatedly refers to the lover as either God, the Word, or Christ, but names Jesus infrequently, as if somehow he is aware that it would be somewhat of a problem to speak about the soul embracing Jesus, who after all, appeared in the form of a man.

To underscore the intensity of the embrace and the conjugal symbolism Ambrose adds at one point that the soul does not simply love the outward appearance but everything about the lover. Not only "his face, as it were, but all his inner parts." That is why the soul adds to the favor of the kiss, "your breasts are better than wine and the fragrance of your ointments is above all perfumes."[20] Ambrose does what might at first glance

---

[18] Ibid. FC 65, 15-16.
[19] Ibid. FC 65, 16.
[20] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.9. FC 65, 16.

seem like a role reversal. Like Origen, Ambrose reads Song of Songs 1.2 in the voice of the feminine speaking to the lover about his breasts being better than wine. What is curious about this reading is that in the rest of the Song, all references to *ubera* invariably occur in descriptions of feminine characters (the bride [1.12b; 4.10; 7.1-13 etc.], the mother of the bride [8.1b], the sister [8.8]). It seems a little odd to have *ubera* in Song of Songs 1.2 referring to the male partner in the drama. Attuned to this oddity, Origen tries to obviate it by suggesting that what is entailed here is a reference to the "bosom" of the groom, in much the same way that the Gospel of John describes the "disciple whom Jesus loved" as inclining on Jesus' breast.[21] Ambrose follows suit.

In the soul's desire for the kiss, "God the Word poured himself into her wholly and laid bare his breasts to her, that is, his teachings and the laws of the wisdom that is within, and was fragrant with the sweet fragrance of his ointments."[22] The movement from the physical representation to the allegorical transposition of his breasts as the teachings of the Word, leaves much of the hermeneutical underpinning in the background, raising interesting questions as to why the allegory of the soul's desire for the kiss is necessary in the first place.

If the topoi in the Song serve to return the interpreter to the teachings of the Word then one might well suspect that the adaptation of the Song to the spiritual union between soul and the Word may be superfluous. Ambrose anticipates and precludes the objection. The Song, read as an allegory of the soul and the divine, points out that "the enjoyment of God is richer than the joy of any bodily pleasure." For Ambrose, the lowly forms of joy are refigured in the Song, so that the soul, held captive to the Word, finds "the fragrance of grace and the forgiveness of sin."[23]

Ambrose's version of the different stages of the soul's ascent is a steady progression from the desire for the kisses of the Word to the final embrace of nuptial union, with themes borrowed from Song of Songs 1.2 through 5.6.

> First, impatient of love and not bearing the delays of the Word, she asked that she might deserve his kisses [Cant. 1.2] and she deserved to see her beloved, and was also led into the king's chamber. Second, as they were

---

[21] Origène, *Commentarium in Canticum Canticorum* 1.2.4., texte, introduction, traduction et notes par Luc Brésard et Henri Crouzel, avec la collaboration de Marcel Borret. Sources Chrétiennes 375 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1991), 192-193. Henceforth SC 375.

[22] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 3.9. FC 65, 16-17.

[23] Ibid.

> speaking with one another, she rested in his shadow, and suddenly the Word departed from her in the middle of their conversation, yet he was not absent for long, for as she sought him, he came leaping over the mountains and bounding over the hills [Cant. 2.8]. Soon after, like a gazelle or hart, while he was speaking to his beloved, he leapt up and left her. Third, although she had not found him by searching in bed and at night, in the city and public places and streets, she finally summoned him back with her prayers and grace, so that she was even called closer by the bridegroom. Fourth, she is now awakened from sleep by him, although she was keeping watch with her heart so that she might hear his voice at once when he knocked. But while she was rising, she experienced a delay, because she would not match the swiftness of the Word. While she was opening the door, the Word passed by [Cant. 5.5-6]; she went out at his word, sought for him through wounds, but wounds of love [Cant. 4.9], and finally and with difficulty, found him and embraced him, so that she might not lose him.[24]

Elaborating on this "ladder of ascent," Ambrose argues, using Song of Songs 5.4, that the beloved awaits the entry of the Word as he sends his "good work through the opening in the door, as it were, still not face to face," increasing the sense of longing and anticipation. For Ambrose, the Word is recognized first in his works somewhat imperfectly. This increases the soul's love, and "once implanted grows in maturity; from the seeds which the soul received in a spiritual womb." The soul, an analogue to the Virgin, receives the Word in a spiritual womb which gives birth to spiritual life as the soul "longs to see the fullness of his divinity dwelling in him in bodily form," alluding to Colossians 2.9.[25] Ambrose's exegesis shows how easily the themes in the Song would have fit Augustine's conception of his new life in philosophy as a nuptial embrace of *Sapientia*. But what does Augustine do?

III. *Augustine's Early Use of the Song of Songs*

Of an estimated forty-five thousand scriptural citations in Augustine's works A.-M. La Bonnardière counts a hundred and sixty-four references to the Song of Songs.[26] La Bonnardière's points out that this amounts to an infrequent to extremely rare usage.[27] Augustine's first reference to the

---

[24] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 6.50. FC 65, 40-41.

[25] Ambrose, *De Isaac uel anima* 6.53. FC 65, 43.

[26] Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 1 (1955) 225-237.

[27] Cf. Elizabeth A. Clark, The Uses of the Song of Songs: Origen and the Later Latin Fathers, in *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, Studies

Song comes in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* (388/389), which is really his first published work after his baptism, even though he had worked on both the *De libero arbitrio* 1 and *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* while in Rome in 388. Augustine uses Song of Songs 4.12, "a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed" (*hortus conclusus, fons signatus*), in arguing for the boundaries of Christian society and liturgical communion. The idea of an enclosed garden, a fountain sealed off, and so preventing the uninitiated from entering in, becomes a recurrent theme in Augustine's encounters with Manichees and Donatists alike. In this, he would be developing a line of thought clearly present in Ambrose's preaching about baptism and its efficacy in Christian community. References to the Song feature in Augustine's later work as pointers to the waters of baptism and the initiation that brings people into the enclosure, and make them fit for receiving the mysteries.[28] Augustine's choice of which parts of the Song he uses and does not use are important even at this early stage in indicating his knowledge of the interpretive possibilities of the Song.

For example, one of the most memorable of Augustine uses of the Song is his adoption of Song of Songs 2.4 (*ordinat in me charitatem*). Given how much the theme of ordered love features prominently in Augustine's theological thought, beginning with *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* soon after his baptism, the very late use of Song of Songs 2.4b is rather unexpected and of little significance.[29] Why he turns to it so late is curious. Augustine gives ample evidence that he knows about the Song and the two main interpretative traditions surrounding it: one, as a description of the love of God and the soul and two, as a description of God's love for the Church. Moreover, Song of Songs 2.4a (*inducite me in domum vini*) and 2.5a and b (*constitute me inter unguenta, constipate me inter mella/quoniam vulnerata charitate ego sum*) appear in Augustine's exposition on Psalm 7, which is among the earliest of his commentaries on the Psalms that he wrote in 392 soon after he become a priest at Hippo.

What is more, we have from question 55 of *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* an attempt by Augustine to make sense of the number of con-

---

in Women and Religion 20 (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986) 386-427. At p. 408 Clark suggests that the infrequent citations of the Song of Songs in Augustine indicates that Augustine "had little interest in the book."

[28] Augustine's *De baptismo* (401) is the classic text along these lines. At various points in *De baptismo* (4.7, 5.27, 6.3, 6.29, 7.51) he refers to Song of Songs 4.12. The references are provided by La Bonnardière, Ibid. 232-233.

[29] La Bonnardière gives five references (p. 231) to Song of Songs 2.4b (*ordinat in me charitatem*), all of which come after 410.

cubines referred to in Song of Songs 6.6 (*Sexaginta sunt reginae, octaginta concubinae, et adulescentulae quarum non est numerus*). Augustine proposes a highly allegorical reading of the passage. He treats the concubines as signifying the souls that seek and gain an earthly reward and as such do not receive the divine embrace. The exact details of Augustine's interpretation is not nearly as important as the attestation it provides of Augustine's willingness to read the details of the Song allegorically. It is impossible to fix with any precision exactly when Augustine conceived this way of interpreting the words of Song of Songs 6.6, since the general provenance of *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* places most of the text within the period between 388 and 395. What it points out, however, is that Augustine and his friends were reading the Song of Songs during this period. And they were doing so with enough interest to think through how to interpret some of its details allegorically.

Perhaps the most curious of all Augustine's early references to the Song is found in *De doctrina christiana* 2.6.7. There Augustine turns to Song of Songs 4.2 and uses it as a description of the bride being praised like a beautiful woman. "Your teeth are like a flock of shorn ewe ascending from the pool, all of which give birth to twins, and there is not a sterile animal among them."[30] Interestingly, Augustine picks up a part of the description of the bride that seems the most unexceptionable and applies it to the Church, while ignoring all that surrounds the verse that he selects. Augustine admits that the metaphor is strange, but he is not exactly sure why it moves him to think of the Church as a sheep whose teeth chew up those who teach error. Still, he finds delightful the idea of comparing the saints to the teeth of the sheep cutting off error and false teaching and moving them into her belly, once they have been softened.

Two aspects of Augustine's use of Song of Songs 4.2 are striking. First, *De doctrina christiana* 2.6.7 says more about the delights of a text than about the "meaning" of the text. So it is unclear whether the "pleasure of the text" or the appeal of a particular metaphor determines the nature of Augustine's exegesis. And second, Augustine's choice of this particular metaphor in describing the beauty of the Church, which he himself admits to be somewhat awkward, seems arbitrary. The answer Augustine provides in *De doctrina christana* 2.6.8 that it is more pleasurable to think in similitudes does not quite resolve the problem of arbitrariness.

---

[30] *Augustine: De doctrina christiana*, trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1995) 63.

In addition, we have already noted how Augustine uses Song of Songs 2.4-5 in his exposition on Psalm 7 to speak about the wounds of God's judgment. Augustine's gloss follows the lines of thought suggested independently by Song of Songs 2.4a & 5. The gloss also implies that Augustine understands God's judgments as the wounds of love which recall the recalcitrant back into the presence of God, where love in all its frightful delights may be enjoyed. The intimations of death in Psalm 7.14 serve as a counterpoint to the idea of being inebriated with God's love in a wine cellar, as Song of Songs 2.4a hints. In spite of all this, Augustine does not show any willingness to use the Song as an elaborate template in describing the love of God and the individual soul in the way that Ambrose does.

If there is one constant element in Augustine early appropriations of the Song of Songs, it lies in his disinterest in adopting the conjugal symbolism of the Song. Augustine attempts none of the exuberant exegesis found in Ambrose. Comparing their respective citations to the Song of Songs does not even begin to capture how much Augustine departs from the Ambrosian model.[31] This is also interesting because Augustine's citations seem to depend on the same textual base as Ambrose's.[32]

La Bonnardière's general remarks about the similarities between Augustine and Ambrose do not highlight the manner in which Augustine's use of the Song involves picking and choosing his way through the putative text. Augustine, because he speaks from the standpoint of the lover, does not

---

[31] A.-M. La Bonnardière, Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 1 (1955) 225-237; Cf. Maria Tajo, Un confronto tra S. Ambrogio e S. Agostino a proposito dell'esegesis del Cantico dei Cantici, *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 7 (1961) 127-151.

La Bonnardière suggests in a table how Augustine's citations bear resemblance to Ambrose's (236). The latter's *De mysteriis* would have been a source for Augustine when he went to receive baptism and there is every indication that that is where Augustine began to make the identification of the relationship between the nuptial hymn and the waters of baptism; the relationship between the bride (the church) and the groom (Christ) made all the more emphatic by Ephesians 5.23-32. Here is the background for the argument of Émile Schmitt's *Le Mariage Chrétien dans l'oeuare de saint Augustin: Une théologie baptismale de la vie conjugale* (Paris:. Études Augustiniennes, 1983). Augustine links Christian baptism to the marriage metaphor in his sacramental theology, since the mystical, spiritual marriage between Christ and the Church is the mystery that is emphasized in Ephesians 5.27.

[32] Solange Sagot, Le 'Cantique des Cantiques' dans le 'De Isaac' d'Ambroise de Milan. Étude textuelle et recherche sure les ancienne versions latines, *Recherches Augustinienne* 16 (1981) 3-57; Cf. La Bonnardière, Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin, and Tajo's Un confronto tra S. Ambrogio e S. Agostino a proposito dell'esegesis del Cantico dei Cantici.

cite any of the sections that have to do with descriptions of the lover, so that almost all of Chapter 3 he ignores or does not quote. The same goes for much of Chapter 7. Augustine's citations seem to avoid almost all the passages that have to do with the allurements of the feminine (what would correspond to the *blandimenta feminea* of *Soliloquia* 1.10.17). So although Augustine speaks in the voice of the lover when he adopts the spousal metaphor, he nevertheless leaves much of the language about the beloved untouched.

There are times when Augustine quotes parts of verses and ignores the rest. In other instances he will select passages around a given motif that he does not seem at all inclined to recall but will use sections in the near vicinity that do not break the pattern that he seems to have established for himself. A case in point is the reference to the teeth of the sheep in Song of Songs 4.2 which I have already alluded to. The passage appears in Ambrose's *De mysteriis* 7.38 in a section where Ambrose speaks about the imagery of the Song as a representation of the love of Christ and the Church. It is quite probable that this is the background that motivated Augustine's use of it. But while Ambrose uses the verse that immediately follows, "your lips are like a band of scarlet/and your speech is sweet" (Song of Songs 4.3: in *De mysteriis* 7.38), Augustine does not cite it ever.

An even more elaborate pattern is at work in Chapter 5. Augustine skips verse 1, cites verses 2 and 3, skips everything in between and cites verse 9. Verses 4-8 are about the lover entering the dwelling of the beloved and then disappearing to leave her longing. Augustine uses verse 3 (*Exui me tunica mea; quomodo induam eam? Lavi pedes meos, quomodo inquinabo illos?*) in a sense that has to do with the baptismal rite: where the one to be baptized takes off a tunic and receives the waters of baptism. Augustine transforms the entire context of the verse from being a prelude to conjugal union to the experience of baptismal regeneration. Ambrose does something similar. Ambrose, however, cites verses 1, 3 and 8 in his *De mysteriis*, and quotes verses 2 through 7 extensively in *De Isaac uel anima* 6.50-55. Ambrose also cites Song of Songs 5.8 and alludes to 5.1 in *De Isaac uel anima* 3.8 and 5.49 respectively.

If the text of the Song is printed with the sections Augustine's quotes highlighted it would reveal an intricate pattern. The "alter-text," the sections of the Song that Augustine does not use, point out something distinctive. It is in an indication of Augustine's disinterest in using conjugal or erotic love as a fitting metaphor for describing the love of God and the individual soul. The thematic elaborations of the Song, with its vivid descrip-

tions, seems to have engendered a mitigated silence on Augustine's part. I should note, however, that Augustine is far from censoring himself. He does not refrain from speaking and writing in some vivid details about human sexuality.[33]

Ambrose, on the other hand, does something Augustine never does. Ambrose, inspired by an image that ultimately goes back to Plato's *Phaedrus*, employs the erotic imagery of the Song of Songs to the fullest. In one instance Ambrose speaks of Christ mounting the soul, as if mounting a chariot. Ambrose combines the language of the winged chariot found in the *Phaedrus* 246-247 with Song of Songs 7.6-8, where the nuptial embrace is described as an ascent along the side of a palm tree. Ambrose's *De Isaac uel anima*, then, offers an entirely different interpretive impulse than anything Augustine proposes.

IV. *The Song of Songs and Augustine's Language of Love*

In *Confessions* 8.11.26 Augustine's old loves whisper in his ear asking him whether he can manage a life of total renunciation. If Augustine belonged to a group of diehards who saw asceticism as the only way forward[34] the route to that end was rather more tortured for him. The question posed to Augustine by the "overwhelming force of habit" gets to the center of the drama: "Do you think you can live without them?" This underwrites the bi-polarities of desire that Augustine presents repeatedly throughout his early writings and in the *Confessions*. He gives up a woman's embrace to be welcomed by the chaste dignity of Continence. He manages with divine aid to overlook the allurements of his old loves and accedes to the enticements (*honeste blandiens*) of Continence (*Confessions* 8.11.27).

Ambrose could speak with aplomb on Song of Songs 3.1ff. about the soul awake at night longing for the embrace of the divine. Augustine preferred the imagery of Psalm 4, which speaks not at all about a divine embrace but about sleep as a consolation and a respite from the distress of sin and disorderliness.[35] At the same time, Augustine tries to speak of his God in a way that captures the depth of love graciously bestowed and

---

[33] Occasionally, Augustine will be forced to speak about the internal organs of the mother of Jesus, because Augustine has to defend the genuine humanity of Jesus and the real nature of the incarnation—the virginal conception and paturition—against its detractors (*De fide et symbolo* 4.10 is an example).

[34] P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* 94ff.

[35] J. J. O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions, vol. 3* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992) 91-92.

enjoyed, and sometimes comes close to breaching his own apparently self-imposed strictures about adopting the erotic symbolism inherent in the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs. But there is a difference.

From Origen through Ambrose and well into the middle ages any number of monastic authors made the Song of Songs the special province of their exegetical labors. Here and there questions about the propriety of the nuptial or erotic imagery come to the surface.[36] Origen had a way of dealing with the apparent difficulties surrounding what the Song of Songs self-evidently seemed to be talking about and what it took to transpose it into an allegorical frame of reference. Origen places the Song of Songs at the third level of instruction into things divine, behind Ecclesiastes and Proverbs. Adopting the three-fold division of philosophy into physics, ethics, and metaphysics, Origen divides the wisdom of Solomon into three levels corresponding to the natural, moral and the mystical.[37] For Origen, the allegorical reading of the Song is reserved for those who have advanced through the first two stages. Consequently, only a mind trained in the other disciplines of the soul, able to overlook the obviously evocative language of the Song, can transcend the primary level of the text into the deeper contemplation that yields the mystical meaning of the Song. The ascesis involved is both intellectual and moral, since it requires an effacement of the text as something other than what it appears. Whether this involved a certain amount of cognitive displacement seems altogether probable. The mystical reading of the Song of Songs as a description of the individual soul's union with God entails a preliminary "overwrite" of the text, so that in the end ascetic, mystical exegesis of the Song of Songs involves the interpretation of a palimpsest.

V. *The Psalms and Augustine's Language of Love*

The conjugal or erotic imagery that we find in Ambrose is absent in Augustine. Although the interpretative traditions Augustine inherited suggested this possibility, Augustine chose not to follow. Augustine's attitude to the Song of Songs is clearly on display in his commentary on Psalm 44 (in the Vulgate numbering).[38] Augustine's lengthy exposition of Psalm

[36] Bernard of Clairvaux draws attention to this in the first of his eighty-six sermons on the Song of Songs.

[37] Origen, *Commentarium in Canticum Canticorum*, Prologue 3.1. SC 375, 128-129.

[38] For another side to Augustine's differences with Ambrose which centers on Psalm 44 see David G. Hunter, The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, *Church History* 69 (2000) 281-303.

44 is almost certainly the kind of interpretation he would have proffered for the Song of Songs if he had attempted to comment fully on the Song. Among modern interpreters of the Hebrew Psalter there is near unanimous agreement that of all the Psalms it is Psalm 44 that comes closest to anything like the Song of Songs.[39] The Psalm develops the theme of a royal wedding and a sacred marriage feast. The wedding and the marriage feast are also linked to the relationship between the king and his people.

In a way Psalm 44 becomes Augustine's surrogate for the Song of Songs.[40] If there were any doubts that Augustine uses Psalm 44 as his surrogate text for the Song, he removes all such ambiguity when he quotes the entire Psalm in two parts in *De civitate Dei* 17.16 as a veritable witness to "Christ's church, wedded to so great a husband by a spiritual marriage and a divine love." In this immediate context Augustine does not mention the Song. But he doesn't have to. It is implied in the reference to the spiritual marriage of divine love between Christ and his Church, so that while Ephesians 5.23-32 provides the primary text for the entire image of Christ's marriage to his spotless bride, the Song of Song stands in the background as the "pre-text" that elicits the kind of elaboration that Augustine puts forth.

A few paragraphs later Augustine is more explicit, mentioning the Song of Songs in tones that recall the nuptial and bridal themes that often linked Ephesians 5.23-32 to the Song in the minds of many interpreters. The Song of Songs, Augustine reminds his readers,

> voices a kind of spiritual delight felt by holy minds in the marriage of the king and the queen of that city, namely, Christ and his Church. But this delight is wrapped up in allegorical draperies, so that it may be more eagerly longed for, and that its uncovering may afford more pleasure, and that the bridegroom may be revealed to whom it is said, in the same song, "Righteousness has loved you," and the bride also, who is told "Love is among your delights."[41]

---

[39] See, for example, T. H. Galder, Psalm 45, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955) 239-251; Christoph Schroeder, "'A Love Song': Psalm 45 in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Marriage Texts," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996) 417-432. And more extensively, Jan Mulder, *Studies on Psalm 45* (Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Karmel Doddendaal, 1972).

[40] For evidence of the use of Psalm 44 (45) in the wider context of the early Christian christological debates see Elisabeth Grünbeck's *Christologische Schriftargumentation und Bildesprache*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae XXVI. Leiden, Brill, 1994. My concerns here are much narrower.

[41] *De civitate Dei* 17.20. *St. Augustine, City of God*, trans. Henry Bettenson (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1984) 757.

Then Augustine adds that "there are many points we pass over without mention, in our anxiety to reach the end of the work" (*De civitate Dei* 17.20). Augustine here adopts one of his standard evasions, claiming to be in haste towards his intended goal. He is willing, however, to acknowledge another kind of pleasure, a "kind of delight felt by holy minds" as they contemplate the Song.

The pleasurable text stands some distance away from any intimations of the soul's nuptial embrace of God, accessible to the perception of chaste minds who are able to remove the wrapping and delve into the mysteries of the text. The delight is not a delight in the love of God as such, but in allegory, the kind of pleasurable discovery and representation spoken of in *De doctrina christiana* 2.6.7. In a sense, the ecclesial reading of the Song also requires its own effacement. But it is not nearly as jarring as the re-writing of the representation of conjugal love as a nuptial union between the soul and God.

If the mitigated silence on the Song of Songs I am arguing here is valid, how does one account for Augustine's love lyricism and the various portraits of love in his works that verge on the model of spousal love? Augustine's affective language often places the desire of the soul in a larger framework that encompass other human longings. Augustine does not attempt anything like an idealization of conjugal or erotic love. And so he does not present spousal love as an analogue of divine love, though he does allude to erotic, physical love as a way of understanding the nature of true desire.[42]

The parallelism between Augustine's errant loves and the love of God appear often enough in such striking language in the *Confessions* that one can easily misconstrue his intentions. In one instance, while discounting the relevance of any such analogy between the love of things beautiful, sweet, fragrant, pleasurable and the like, Augustine finds himself straining to describe the love of God in ways that build on precisely these approximate images of true beauty. He speaks of the love of God as "a kind of embrace," an embrace at once peculiar and allusively nuptial. But, set in the midst of other sensory images, the representation of the love of God as an embrace of Augustine's inner self suggests that the nuptial imagery may not be the most apposite. And all the more so when he describes his love of God as

> a light, voice, food, embrace of my inner self, where my soul is floodlit by light which space cannot contain, where there is sound that time cannot seize,

[42] See, for example, *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 26.4.

> where there is a perfume which no breeze disperses, where there is a taste for food no amount of wanting can lessen, and where there is a bond of union that no satiety can part. This is what I love when I love my God.[43]

If this were not enough, Augustine presents the sheer luminosity of the divine presence by speaking of the fire that consumes, fire that sets him ablaze, setting all this once again in the context of the five primary senses. Captured as part of his sense of late joy, Augustine's representations allude to images of Wisdom in Proverbs 2-8; of thirsting in Psalm 41; and possibly of the lover and the beloved in the Song of Songs.

> You were with me, and I was not with you. The lovely things kept me far from you, though if they did not have their existence in you, they had no existence at all. You called and cried out loud and shattered my deafness. You were radiant and resplendent, you put to flight my blindness, You were fragrant, and I drew in my breadth and now pant after you. You touched me, and I am set on fire to attain the peace which is yours.[44]

The fusion of these disparate themes and images does not disrupt the consistent use of tactile language along the same lines in which Augustine employs the idea of an embrace.

Augustine recognizes in the many disparate forms of human longing what it is to love God.

> For with you is the fountain of life and in your light we shall see light. Give me one who loves, and he feels what I am saying. Give me one who desires, give me one who hungers, give me one traveling and thirsting in this solitude and sighing for the fountain of an eternal homeland, give me such a one, and he knows what I am saying. But if I speak to someone cold and unresponsive, he knows not what I speak.[45]

The embrace does not stand as the primary image through which Augustine speaks of the soul's longing. If anything, he goes out of his way to make sure that his language employs images of all the primary senses in an attempt to situate his language about longing in a broader framework.

And yet it is the language of being inflamed that sets Augustine's sensibilities in its characteristic hue, denoting the cauterizing effect of the chastening love of God. Augustine describes this ardent love as one of

---

[43] *Confessiones* 10.6.8. *Saint Augustine: Confessions,* trans. Henry Chadwick 183.

[44] *Confessiones* 10.27.38. Ibid., 201.

[45] *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 26.4.3. FC 78, 263. Augustine has the same idea in *De libero arbitrio* 2.13.

certainty and not of vague feeling (*non dubia, sed certa*). The language appears early in Augustine's *Contra Academicos*. So what we find in the *Confessions* is a well-established sensibility that lends an impassioned tone to Augustine's intellectual efforts.

Fire tends to move upwards, Augustine states in *Confessions* 13.9.10. In a world of oiled lamps, where the flame ushers in the light that preempts the darkness of night, the corresponding images of light and fire are inseparable. Augustine sees in the upward movement of fire, some intimation of the ascent to which he believes the soul is called, an ascent that reaches its fulfillment because inspired and inflamed by a greater flame: that is, God of God, Light from Light.

Cognizant of how much his own approach to the soul's ascent to God has moved away from Neoplatonic sensibilities, Augustine describes the ascent as the journey to Jerusalem.

> My weight is my love. Wherever I am carried, my love is carrying me. By your gift we are set on fire and carried upwards: we grow red hot and ascend. We climb "the ascents in our heart," and sing the "song of steps." Lit by your fire, your good fire, we grow red-hot and ascend, as we move upwards "to the peace of Jerusalem." For I was glad when they said to me, let us go to the house of the Lord. There we will be brought to our place by a good will, so that we want nothing but to stay there for ever.[46]

Augustine's ascent is in keeping with the earthly pilgrimage of the City of God as it journeys towards the heavenly Jerusalem. "Love lifts us there, and your good Spirit exalts our humble estate from the gates of death" (*Confessions* 13.9.10).

Singing the songs of ascent allows Augustine to capture his longing in the language of desire found in the Psalms: desire (*desiderium*) without eros, love (*caritas, amor, delectio*) without self-possessiveness (*cupiditas*). To paraphrase Augustine's words about using what little talents he has in order that he might not lose them (*De doctrina christiana* 1.1): the love of God is not properly possessed if it is not shared, since it does not decrease in being the common possession of many. This social idea of love is central to Augustine's conception of divine love and how it is appropriated and experienced by human beings. This, I suggest, is part of the reason that Augustine does not adopt conjugal love as a fitting metaphor for describing the love of God and the soul. Conjugal love remains fundamentally exclusionary, whereas the love of God is be shared with others.

---

[46] *Confessiones* 13.9.10. *Saint Augustine: Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick 278-279.

In one of his late homilies, Sermon 34, we find Augustine appealing to erotic love, in his attempt to make poignant for his listeners the exceptional character and object of desiring and loving God. Augustine appeals in part to his listeners' modesty. He also seems to ask permission for the audacity it requires to venture even such a comparison or analogy. Augustine begins: "At the risk of shocking your charity, I am going to say (*Audeo dicere caritati uestrae*), 'let us observe at the lower level what we may expect to find at the higher level.' The lowest kind of earthly love, the sordid love which sets its sights on bodily charms, can teach us something useful which we can apply at the higher and purer level."[47] This is as far as Augustine goes, that physical love can teach us something useful. But beyond that it can do no better. Augustine's comments in Sermon 34 are a far cry from Ambrose's appropriation of the erotic imagery of the Song of Songs. As Augustine decries the sordid nature of bodily love (and by extension conjugal love), he underscores how inadequate it is to attempt to capture the nature of divine love through the language and symbolism of erotic love. The risk of shocking "your love," the audacity Augustine mentions, represents Augustine's own sense of impropriety in using this "muddy kind of lust" (*ista lutulenta cupiditate*) to speak of the most radiant kind of love (*illuminatissima caritate*), namely the love of God.[48]

Augustine's studied indifference to employing the conjugal and erotic imagery of the Song of Songs suggests a critical stance towards the early Christian tradition of reading the Song as an allegorical rendition of the soul's "conjugal" embrace of the divine. At the very least, Augustine demonstrates that an affective spirituality of the soul's ascent to God does not need the Song of Songs to underwrite its language of love.

Villanova University, Dept. of Core Humanities
800 Lancester Avenue
Villanova, Pennsylvania 19085-1699

[47] *Sermo* 34.4 (CCSL 41, 425). *Augustine. Sermons III/1. The Works of St. Augustine. A New Translation for the 21st Century*, trans. Edmund Hill (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City Press, 1990) 167.

[48] *Sermo* 34.5 (CCSL 41, 425).

ERZÄHLER UND CHARAKTER ZUGLEICH.
ZUR LITERARISCHEN FUNKTION DES „PETRUS" IN DEM NACH IHM BENANNTEN EVANGELIENFRAGMENT

VON

TOBIAS NICKLAS

Unter den vier Hauptunterschieden, welche T. Zahn zwischen dem am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts aufgeregt diskutierten „Petrusevangelium" (= PE)[1] und den vier kanonischen Evangelien auflistet, nennt er als erstes die eigentümliche Tatsache, dass der Erzähler des erstgenannten Textes mit seinem „Ich" hervortritt und dass dieses „Ich" sich selbst als Simon Petrus identifiziert sowie Andreas seinen Bruder nennt.[2] So klar ersichtlich dies ist, so sehr verwundert, dass die sich hieraus ergebende literarische Problematik m.W. noch nie genauer unter die Lupe genommen wurde: „Petrus"[3] als Charakter agiert ja auf einer anderen Ebene von Kommunikation und besitzt eine andere Perspektive[4] auf die erzählte Welt als der Erzähler

[1] Gefunden wurde, um genau zu sein, natürlich nicht das „Petrusevangelium", sondern die heute ins 6. Jahrhundert datierte Pergamenthandschrift PCair 10759, die aber gerade aufgrund der Tatsache, dass Petrus hier als Erzähler auftritt, mit dem bei Serapion von Antiochien (Euseb, *h.e.* VI 12,3-6) erwähnten „Evangelium nach Petrus" identifiziert wurde. Zur Datierung, vgl. G. Cavallo & H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A.D. 300-800* (BIC.S 47; London 1987) 90.

[2] Vgl. T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Petrus. Das kürzlich gefundene Fragment seines Textes* (Erlangen-Leipzig 1893) 16-17.

[3] Die Tatsache, dass die literarische Figur „Petrus" weder auf der Ebene der Charaktere der erzählten Welt noch gar auf der des Erzählers einfach mit dem historischen Petrus ineinsgesetzt werden kann, braucht nicht besonders hervorgehoben zu werden.

[4] Der Begriff „Perspektive" bzw. „Point of View" wird in erster Linie auf der Ebene des Erzählers und seines Gegenübers gebraucht. R. Alter, *The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age* (New York u.a. 1989) 172, beschreibt den „Point of View" einer Erzählung als „particular angle from which we are invited by the nature of the narration to imagine the narrated personages, places and events." Eine griffige Definition im Hinblick auf biblische Erzählungen gibt auch J. Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie, Bd. 2: Das johanneische Zeitverständnis* (WUNT 117; Tübingen 1998) 160-161. Diese Perspektive lässt sich

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 318-326

„Petrus".[5] Wie hat der Autor des PE diese beiden Dimensionen verknüpft? Diese Frage ist aber nicht nur an sich interessant: Wichtiger ist, dass sie auch Licht auf die literarischen Fähigkeiten[6] und Aussageintentionen des Verfassers dieses apokryphen Textes wirft.[7]

1. *„Petrus" als Charakter der erzählten Welt*

Nur an zwei Stellen tritt „Petrus" als Charakter der erzählten Welt in Erscheinung. Dies sind die VV. 26-27 sowie 59-60, wo der überlieferte Bestand der Erzählung unvermittelt abbricht.

---

dann mit B. Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition. The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1973) 6, in die Ebenen des „ideological" (evaluativ), „phraseological" (spielt in biblischer und verwandter Erzählung keine Rolle), „spatial" (räumlich), „temporal" (zeitlich) und „psychological" (bezogen auf die Innensicht der Charaktere) Point of View einteilen. Doch nicht nur der Erzähler, auch die Charaktere besitzen eine Perspektive auf die erzählte Welt: So sind sie an die erzählte Zeit gebunden, an die Orte der erzählten Szenen. Nur partiell ist ihnen Einsicht in das Innere der Mitakteure gegeben, und auch ihre evaluative Perspektive muss sich nicht mit der des Erzählers decken. Vgl. hierzu M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative. Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington 1985) 172: „The 'characters perspective' differs from all the others . . . in its multiplicity. And it is their divergence—in interest, interpretation, world view, scenario, hope and fear—that keeps the action going, just as their convergence makes for its resolution. . . . What such diverse figural perspectives have in common is the inherent limitation of knowledge and liability to misjudgment, which motivates the progress of the tale."

[5] Zum vorausgesetzten Kommunikationsmodell narrativer Kritik, vgl. z.B. die übersichtliche Darstellung von S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca-London 1978) 267. Eine kurze methodische Zusammenfassung mit Definition der Begriffe „impliziter Autor", „impliziter Leser", „Erzähler", „Gegenüber", „Charakter" der erzählten Welt bietet auch M.A. Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis 1990) 19-21.

[6] Eine pauschale Abwertung des literarischen Wertes neutestamentlicher Apokryphen, wie sie v.a. bei M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses* (Oxford 1924 (ND 1972)) xiii, begegnet, dürfte m.E. eher den Blick auf mögliche Entdeckungen verstellen als weiterführen.

[7] Klargestellt sei, dass natürlich die Ergebnisse einer derartigen Untersuchung aufgrund einerseits des nur fragmentarischen Erhaltungszustandes des PE, andererseits auch wegen der großen Unsicherheiten über die textliche Qualität des einzigen für eine Auslegung infrage kommenden Fragments selbst in gewisser Weise fragmentarisch bleiben müssen.

1.1. *VV. 26-27*

Diese erste Stelle, an der „Petrus" noch—zumindest aus der Abfolge des erhaltenen Fragments heraus—verhüllt in der Ich-Form spricht, wirkt wie eine unvermittelte Einblendung in die Schilderung der dramatischen Ereignisse um den Tod Jesu. Dafür sprechen nicht nur der abrupte Ortswechsel und die plötzliche Einführung von Personen, die zumindest in den erhaltenen Versen des überlieferten Fragments noch keine Rolle spielten, sondern vor allem auch die Tatsache, dass von keiner Interaktion zwischen den „Jüngern" und den weiteren Akteuren der Erzählung die Rede sein kann. Zwar suchen die „Juden" die „Jünger" als κακοῦργοι, diese Notiz dient aber zunächst zur Begründung (γάρ) der Tatsache, dass diese sich verstecken (ἐκρυβόμεθα). „Petrus" ist also hier ein Teil der „Jünger", die insgesamt eine Einheit, also eigentlich nur *einen* Charakter, bilden. Dieser ist wie in einer Nussschale von den übrigen Ereignissen abgeschnitten, am Geschehen um die Kreuzigung und das Begräbnis des „Herrn" nicht *beteiligt*, er nimmt aber regen *Anteil* daran. In dieser Reaktion auf den Tod Jesu werden die „Jünger" gleichzeitig mit den „Juden", deren Handeln (VV. 25.28) geradezu einen Rahmen um VV. 26-27 bildet, kontrastiert.

Was lässt sich aus den wenigen Angaben des Textes über die Perspektive des Charakters „Petrus" bzw. „Jünger" auf die erzählte Welt folgern? Nicht ganz eindeutig zu ermitteln ist bereits die räumliche Perspektive. Dies liegt zum Teil daran, dass die VV. 25-26 zwar eine Trennung von den „Juden" voraussetzen, aber kein konkreter Ort genannt ist, an dem sich die „Jünger" verstecken. Gleichzeitig verhindert die Bindung an diesen Ort, dass sie zu Zeugen der ab V. 34 erzählten Auferstehungsereignisse werden. Aufschlussreich in mehrerlei Hinsicht ist auch die wiederholte Betonung der Trauer der Jünger (ἐλυπούμην, ἐκαθεζόμεθα πενθοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες):[8] Diese macht einerseits klar, dass sie um die *an anderem Orte* stattfindenden Ereignisse um Jesus Bescheid wissen.[9] Andererseits aber gibt sie auch Aufschluss über die *zeitliche Begrenzung* des Jüngerperspektive: Durch ihre Trauer wird deutlich, dass ihnen die *nachfolgenden* Ereignisse der Auferstehung Jesu zum Zeitpunkt des Trauerns noch nicht bekannt sind. Gemeinsam mit

---

[8] Zur Schilderung der Traurigkeit der „Jünger", vgl. L. Vaganay, *L'Évangile de Pierre* (ÉtB; Paris 1930) 273.337.

[9] Die Tatsache, dass sich die Trauer auf den Tod Jesu bezieht, ist zwar nicht explizit genannt. Der Kontext ist hier aber so eindeutig, dass diese „Leerstelle" leicht vom Leser gefüllt werden kann.

den Angaben über das „Fasten“[10] hat die Erwähnung der Trauer natürlich aber vor allem die Funktion Einblick in die evaluative Perspektive der Jünger zu geben: Sie missbilligen das an ihrem „Herrn“ Geschehene zutiefst und sind verzweifelt über die Situation, nicht eingreifen zu können.

Nur wenig lässt sich schließlich aus den sparsamen Angaben des Textes über die psychologische Perspektive der „Jünger“ auf die Ereignisse der erzählten Welt sagen. Zumindest aber die Tatsache, dass die Flucht ins Versteck mit einer Aktion der „Juden“ begründet wird, zeigt an, dass die „Jünger“ über deren Pläne informiert sind, während den „Juden“ ihr Versteck nicht zugänglich zu sein scheint.

1.2. *VV. 59-60*

Auch die zweite Szene, in der „Petrus“ direkt zur Sprache kommt, VV. 59-60, erweist sich als deutlich vom Kontext abgegrenzt. Das „Wir“ der Jünger stellt sich den Vielen aus V. 58 gegenüber, die alle in ihre Häuser zurückkehren. Auch hier findet keine Interaktion zwischen den „Jüngern“ und anderen Personen statt. Im Gegensatz zu VV. 25f. setzt sich in V. 60 „Simon Petrus“ von der zunächst wiederum als Einheit betrachteten Gruppe der „Zwölf“ ab.[11] Doch bilden, soweit der fragmentarische Zustand des überlieferten Textes Schlüsse zulässt, die „Jünger“ wiederum eine in sich geschlossene, ja geradezu erzählerisch eingekapselte Gruppe, die vom vorangegangenen Geschehen abgeschnitten scheint.

Was Raum und Zeit angeht, sind die „Jünger“ natürlich wieder an die Ordnung der erzählten Welt gebunden. Jeder geht—analog zu den heimkehrenden Festgästen—εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.[12] Erstaunlich aber ist vor allem die Tatsache, dass sie noch immer „weinen und trauern“: Dies heißt ja, dass sie von den bereits geschehenen Ereignissen um die Auferweckung des „Herrn“ noch nichts wissen können, ja dass nicht einmal die in VV.

---

[10] Zu dieser Thematik, vgl. M.G. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre* (SC 201; Paris 1973) 157-159.

[11] Spekulationen um die Frage, ob sich aus der Erwähnung der Zwölfzahl schließen ließe, das PE habe den Verrat des Judas nicht gekannt, führen m.E. hier nicht weiter. Eher ist wohl daran zu denken, dass der Autor hier die traditionelle „Zwölf“ voraussetzt ohne über das angesprochene Problem zu reflektieren. Auch 1Kor 15,5 spricht ja von den „Zwölf“ ohne Folgerungen auf Traditionen über Judas Iskariot sinnvoll zu machen.

[12] Wo dieser οἶκος ist, lässt sich aus den Angaben des Fragments aber nicht entnehmen.

50-57 erzählte Grabesgeschichte um „Maria von Magdala und ihre Freundinnen" ihre Perspektive verändert hat.[13] Dieser Eindruck wird weiter verstärkt durch die Erwähnung der Tatsache, dass Petrus und Andreas ihre Netze nehmen und zum „Meer"[14] gehen, also wohl ihre frühere Tätigkeit wiederaufnehmen wollen. Bevor aber eine Fortführung der Erzählung weitergehende Folgerungen erlauben würde, bricht das erhaltene Fragment mitten im Satz ab.

2. *Der Erzähler des PE und seine Perspektive*

Während der Charakter „Petrus" an Raum und Zeit der erzählten Welt gebunden ist, gilt dies keineswegs für den ja dauernd anwesenden „Erzähler"[15] der Geschichte, der sich nur an wenigen Stellen als „Petrus" zu erkennen gibt. Besonders deutlich wird dies in der Dimension des Räumlichen:

(1) In den VV. 1-5 wechselt der Fokus des Erzählten mehrfach zwischen „Herodes" und „Pilatus". Dies ist umso erstaunlicher, als sich diese ab V. 3 an unterschiedlichen, wenn auch nicht näher bezeichneten Orten aufhalten.

(2) Obwohl der Charakter „Petrus" sich im Versteck aufhält (VV. 26-27), werden die Verspottung (VV. 6-9) und die Ereignisse der Kreuzigung sowie des Todes Jesu (VV. 10-23) erzählt. Daran ist besonders erstaunlich, dass der Erzähler von einer Finsternis zu berichten weiß, die „ganz Judäa" bedeckt (V. 15b: καὶ σκότος κατέσχε πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν), sowie von einem Beben der „ganzen Erde" (V. 21b: καὶ ἡ γῆ πᾶσα ἐσείσθη).

(3) Breiten Raum gibt der Erzähler auch der Schilderung der Ereignisse in der Nacht zum „Herrentag", die dem Charakter „Petrus" offensichtlich verborgen sind.

(4) Vor diesem Hintergrund überrascht es nicht, dass wir den Erzähler auch an der Seite der Schriftgelehrten, Pharisäer und Ältesten (V. 28) finden, dass er berichtet, dass gleichzeitig (αὐτῆς ὥρας) mit dem Tode Jesu der Vorhang des Tempels zerreißt usw.

Die *zeitliche Perspektive* des Erzählers erweist sich nicht nur aus der Schilderung der Ereignisse um Jesu Auferstehung als *nachösterlich.* Bereits V. 3 mit seiner Vorwegnahme des Todes Jesu spricht dafür, dass der

---

[13] Vgl. ähnlich Vaganay, *Pierre*, 331.

[14] Dass hier das „Meer von Galiläa" bzw. der „See Gennesaret" gemeint sein könnte, lässt sich aus dem Kontext des Fragments nicht erweisen.

[15] Zur literaturwissenschaftlichen Kategorie des Erzählers, angewandt auf biblische Literatur, vgl. z.B. J. Staley, *The Print's First Kiss. A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBL.DS 82; Atlanta 1988) 37-38.

Erzähler von seinem zeitlichen Standpunkt aus mehr weiß, als der Verlauf der Handlung verrät. Für diese Beobachtung lassen sich aber nicht nur zeitliche Angaben oder Vorwegnahmen kommender Ereignisse deuten, vor allem sprechen die christologischen Aussagen, die der Erzähler schon *vor* dem Tode Jesu mit diesem verbindet, dafür, dass die Jesusgestalt schon als eine in ihrer *Bedeutung gedeutete* vorausgesetzt ist:[16] Genannt sei z.B. der Titel Κύριος, der den „Jesus"-Namen praktisch völlig ersetzt, die Bezeichnung Jesu als „Sohn Gottes" (VV. 6.9.45.46), „König Israels" (VV. 7.10) sowie die Deutung als σωτὴρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (V. 13) im Munde des κακοῦργος am Kreuz.

Vielleicht lässt sich die zeitliche Perspektive des Erzählers aber noch ein wenig mehr präzisieren: So spricht V. 25 von κρίσις und τέλος Jerusalems. Mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit ist hier auf die—aus Sicht des Erzählers bereits zurückliegenden—Ereignisse der Zerstörung der Stadt im Jahre 70 angespielt. Dafür spricht wohl auch die eigenartige Notiz (V. 26), dass die „Jünger" gesucht würden, weil sie angeblich planten den Tempel anzuzünden. Diese erklärt sich m.E. am besten als Seitenhieb gegen die „Juden", die das drohende Ende Jerusalems zwar richtig mit der Verbrennung des Tempels in Verbindung bringen, fälschlicherweise aber den „Jüngern" die Schuld dafür zuschieben wollen:[17] Eine solche Bemerkung gewinnt aber erst aus einer Sicht nach den Ereignissen des Jüdischen Krieges ihre eigentliche Schärfe.

Auch die *psychologische Perspektive* des Erzählers geht weit über die des Charakters „Petrus" hinaus. An mehreren Stellen zeigt er, dass er innere Regungen oder Gefühle der von ihm gezeichneten Charaktere kennt: So erwähnt er das Wissen des „Josef" (V. 3) über den kommenden Tod Jesu oder die Furcht der „Frauen" am Grab (VV. 50.57). Besonders häufig aber zeichnet der Innenansichten der „Juden": Er kennt ihre Aufregung und Angst wegen der Finsternis über Judäa (V. 15), die Meinung mancher, es

---

[16] Zur Christologie des PE vgl. z.B. P.M. Head, On the Christology of the Gospel of Peter, *VigChr* 46 (1992) 209-224, und J.W. McCant, The Gospel of Peter. Docetism Reconsidered, *NTS* 30 (1984) 258-273. Nicht eingegangen werden soll in diesem Zusammenhang auf die vor allem auf das Serapion-Zeugnis zurückzuführende Frage, inwieweit sich die Christologie des PE als „doketisch" oder zumindest „doketisch beeinflusst" erweist. Vgl. z.B. N. Brox, 'Doketismus'—eine Problemanzeige, *ZKG* 95 (1984) 301-314, der zu Recht vor einem naiven Umgang mit diesen Begriffen warnt.

[17] Vgl. ähnlich Mara, *Pierre*, 156. Auch die Bemerkung die Jünger seien τετρωμένοι κατὰ διάνοιαν gewesen, könnte mit ihrem möglichen Bezug auf 2Makk 3,16f. in diese Richtung weisen.

sei Nacht (V. 18), ihre Furcht wegen des Erdbebens (V. 21) oder die Freude nach dem Wiedererscheinen der Sonne (V. 23). Vor dem Innenleben *eines* Charakters aber macht die Erzählung zumindest im überlieferten Fragment Halt:[18] Dies ist Jesus, der „Herr",[19] der geheimnisvoll und undurchsichtig—und damit dem Erzähler überlegen—bleibt: In gewisser Weise scheint er—bis auf den Aufschrei in V. 19—vom Geschehen um ihn völlig unberührt.

Schließlich bleibt noch die Aufgabe einer Analyse der *evaluativen Perspektive* des Erzählers. Zumindest an zwei Aspekten kann gezeigt werden, dass gerade in dieser Dimension der Charakter „Petrus" und der Erzähler wenigstens ansatzweise konvergieren:

(1) Was der Erzähler vom Verhalten der „Juden" Jesus gegenüber denkt, macht er in V. 17 explizit: καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν πάντα καὶ ἐτελείωσαν κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.[20] Das Verhalten der „Juden" wird also als „Erfüllung" der Schrift gedeutet.[21] Gleichzeitig machen diese damit das Maß ihrer Sünden voll. Zumindest der letzte Aspekt könnte sich auch im Verhalten der Jünger—und damit des Petrus—zeigen: Wie oben bereits angedeutet wurde, darf dies zumindest als Zeichen der Missbilligung des Verhaltens der „Juden" gegenüber Jesus gedeutet werden.

(2) Die wenigen Angaben in VV. 26f. und 59f. lassen zwar keine Schlüsse zu, welche genaue Sicht der Charakter „Petrus" von Jesus hat: Sieht er in ihm schon den „Herrn", den „Sohn Gottes", als den ihn der Erzähler direkt und indirekt bezeichnet? Die Zuordnung des Petrus zu den Zwölf

---

[18] Natürlich wird auch über die beiden Übeltäter am Kreuz nichts gesagt. Zumindest das Denken dessen, der in V. 13 spricht, lässt sich bereits aus seinen Worten entnehmen. Eine weitere Zeichnung innerer Regungen ist hier ebensowenig notwendig wie z.B. bei „Pilatus", dessen „Sicht der Dinge" sich ebenfalls aus seinem Handeln folgern lässt.

[19] Die umstrittene Bemerkung, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐσιώπα ὡς μηδένα πόνον ἔχων (V. 10b) ist wohl philologisch zweideutig, der Kontext aber lässt eine kausale Interpretation von ὡς nicht zu. Eher ist daran zu denken, dass hier wie in frühchristlichen Märtyrerberichten (vgl. z.B. MartPol 8,3) das heldenhafte Überwinden des Schmerzes thematisiert ist. Vgl. hierzu auch J.D. Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke. The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco u.a. 1988) 180; Head, Christology, 212-213; McCant, Gospel, 261-262.

[20] D. Lührmann, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (MThSt 59; Marburg, 2000) 87, gibt hier folgende Textform: [καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν πάν]τα. Eine Neuuntersuchung des Manuskripts PCair 10759 ergab aber, dass der Text hier vollständig lesbar ist.

[21] Zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des PE, vgl. v.a. J. Denker, *Die theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Petrusevangeliums. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Doketismus* (EHS XXIII.36; Bern-Frankfurt am Main 1975) 58-77.

bzw. den Gefährten wie auch die gegen die „Jünger" gerichtete Verfolgungsaktion der „Juden" macht aber deutlich, dass er zumindest eine hohe Meinung von Jesus hat, dieser den zentralen Bezugspunkt seines Lebens bildet.

3. *Fazit*

Zumindest für das überlieferte Fragment des PE lässt sich eine Abkapselung des Charakters „Petrus" bzw. der „Jünger" von den Ereignissen um den Tod Jesu, die hauptsächlich von den „Juden" getragen werden, beobachten: Wie „Jesus" nehmen sie eigentlich nicht am Geschehen teil und treten in keinerlei Dialog mit den anderen Akteuren der erzählten Welt.[22] Dass sie von den „Juden" als Verbrecher gesucht werden, stellt eine weitere Parallele zum Charakter „Jesus" her. Als nicht unmittelbar Involvierte, trotzdem aber Betroffene, rücken die Jünger in eine eigenartige „Zuschauer"-Rolle:[23] Zwar sind sie räumlich getrennt von den Ereignissen um den Tod Jesu, ihre Trauer verrät aber, dass sie doch wissen, was geschieht. Als Verfolgte sind sie zur selben Passivität wie Jesus gezwungen, in ihrer Trauer und ihrem Fasten tun sie das einzige, was ihnen möglich ist.

Bei allen Einschränkungen in der Perspektive der Charaktere „Jünger" bzw. „Petrus" besteht aber zumindest grundlegende Kontinuität zwischen ihrer evaluativen Perspektive und der des *nahezu* allwissend auftretenden Erzählers. Woher dieser sein Wissen, welches ja weit über das des *Charakters* „Petrus" hinausgeht, bezieht, wird zumindest im erhaltenen Fragment nicht thematisiert.[24] Dieses Zueinander von Erzähler und Charakter „Petrus" wirkt sich nun in komplementärer Weise aus: Einerseits ist das grundsätzliche Vertrauen, welches der Leser eines narrativen Textes dessen Erzähler entgegenbringt, zu bedenken:[25] Die Identifikation des Erzählers mit dem

---

[22] Die Tatsache, dass Jesus in dem erhaltenen Rest der Passion in keinerlei Beziehung zu seinen Richtern oder den „Juden" tritt, hat auch K. Beyschlag, *Die verborgene Überlieferung von Christus* (München-Hamburg 1969) 37, betont: „Jesus hat mit diesen Gottlosen um sich herum eben nicht das Geringste zu schaffen."

[23] Natürlich sind die „Jünger" nicht als Zuschauer der Ereignisse unter dem Kreuz geschildert. Die beobachtete eigentümliche Zwitterstellung zwischen ihrer räumlichen Abwesenheit, aber ihrem gleichzeitigen Wissen um den Tod Jesu, das sich ja in ihrer Trauer offenbart, lässt jedoch m.E. den Begriff „Zuschauer" zumindest im übertragenen Sinne zu.

[24] Sicher spielt dabei die im Fragment wohl *noch* nicht erzählte, aber zu erwartende Erfahrung des Auferstandenen—in welcher Form auch immer—eine Rolle.

[25] Vgl. hierzu Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 227.

Charakter „Petrus" *stiftet* somit Autorität, indem sie diesen Charakter zum Letztgültiges aussprechenden Interpreten und Zeugen der Ereignisse um die Passion Jesu[26] hochstilisiert. Andererseits setzt die Tatsache, dass als Erzähler ausgerechnet „Petrus" gewählt wird, natürlich bereits eine gewisse Autorität und damit Wirkungsgeschichte des *historischen* Petrus voraus. Diese macht sich der Verfasser des Textes zunutze: Indem er seinen „Erzähler" mit Petrus identifiziert, unterstützt er auch dessen gegenüber dem Leser überlegene Stellung. Der Kreislauf der Wechselwirkungen kann beginnen. Dieses Spiel birgt aber eine Gefahr: Wo der Anspruch des Erzählers als „historischer" Petrus zu sprechen als falsch entlarvt wird, zersetzt diese Erkenntnis auch das Vertrauen in den Anspruch des Erzählers letztgültige Interpretation des „Herrn" zu liefern. Dieser auf *narrativer* Ebene als bedeutsam erwiesene Vorgang ist *geschichtlich* erstmals sicher bei Serapion von Antiochien (Eusebius, *h.e.* VI 12,3) greifbar, wenn dieser einen wie auch immer zu bestimmenden „doketischen" und damit nicht-petrinischen Ursprung des PE bezeugt[27]—und es deswegen ablehnt.

Universität Regensburg
Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät
D-93040 *Regensburg* BRD

[26] Die Wendung „Passion Jesu" ist natürlich aus dem Grunde gewählt, weil wir aus den erhaltenen Fragmenten nicht schließen können, was das PE außerdem noch erzählte.

[27] Zum Zeugnis des Serapion, vgl. v.a. die instruktive Untersuchung von E. Junod, Eusèbe de Césarée, Sérapion d'Antioche et l'Évangile de Pierre. D'un évangile à un pseudépigraphe, *RSLR* 24 (1988), 3-16; bzw. Ibid., Comment l'*Évangile de Pierre* s'est trouvé écarté des lectures de l'Église dans les années 200, *Le mystère apocryphe. Introduction à une littérature méconnue* (Hg. J.-D. Kaestli & D. Marguerat; Essais Bibliques 26; Genf 1995) 43-46.

REVIEWS

Samuel Fernández, *Cristo Médico, según Orígenes. La actividad médica como metáfora de la acción divina.* Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 64. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum 1999. 327 pages. ISBN 88-7961-033-3. Price 65000 Lire.

This monograph represents the doctoral dissertation of a young Chilean scholar, prepared at the Augustinianum in Rome under the supervision of Professor Manlio Simonetti. Specialists in the thought of Origen will certainly be interested in it, because it is the first systematic treatment on this scale of the metaphor of illness and healing so pervasive in the Alexandrian's writings. The book is divided into four parts. The first introduces the necessary background, both in the philosophical and the biblical tradition. The author then studies his theme from the viewpoint of the illness (Part 2), the patient (Part 3) and the doctor (Part 4). These three parts correspond exactly to the three aspects of the practice of medicine, as defined in the Hippocratic corpus (*Epid.* 1.2.5). The last-mentioned part is again divided into two, first expounding the role of God as doctor and then that of Christ as doctor. In these three parts an exhaustive analysis is given of the numerous texts scattered throughout the *corpus Origenianum* in which the metaphor of illness and healing is employed.

The author is very conscious of the importance of methodological and hermeneutical considerations. He is convinced that Origen is above all an exegete, and that the use of the metaphor of illness and healing is generally prompted by the motive of biblical exposition. In this context he made an interesting discovery, namely that the theme of Christ the doctor is almost always prompted by accounts and pronouncements in the Gospels, but that this is not the case for the theme of God the doctor, which is usually occasioned by more general discussions of a theological nature. This particular theme, it emerges, is particularly suited for discussions of divine providence and the divine economy of salvation, which for Origen is inseparably connected to questions of human free will and divine action. Fernández concludes that it gives us valuable insights into the two doctrines that constitute Origen's hermeneutic *Vorverständnis*, namely the doctrine of divine goodness and the doctrine of the free human will. It will be plain from

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

the above summary that this book will be of value not only for Origen specialists, but also for all those who are interested in central dogmas of early Christian theology.

University of Leiden DAVID T. RUNIA

David Frankfurter, *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (Religions in the Greco-Roman World 134). Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 1998, xiv + 516 pp. + 4 diagrams & 7 plates, ISBN 90-04-11127-1, DFL 276 / $ 162,50 (clothbound with book jacket).

Die 14 Beiträge verschiedener Autoren behandeln nicht nur das spätantike Ägypten, sondern reichen zeitlich von der pharaonischen bis in die byzantinische Epoche und räumlich bis in den Nahen Osten. In den fünf Teilen des Buches werden historische, religionswissenschaftliche und literarische Themen erörtert, aber auch archäologische Beschreibungen von Pilgerheiligtümern gegeben.

Der Herausgeber erläutert in der Einleitung, die den ersten Teil des Buches bildet, daß die ägyptisch-christlichen Traditionen als Beispiel für das Gesamtphänomen der Wallfahrt in der Religionsgeschichte des Mittelmeerraumes betrachtet werden sollen. Das Phänomen gibt aber gleichzeitig Aufschluß über das Christentum selbst: „And since the growth of Christian pilgrimage is inextricably connected to the phenomenon and process of Christianization itself, the larger topic to which this volume pertains is not pilgrimage *per se* – as a human ideal – but rather the nature of Christianization as it plants itself in the landscape with pilgrimage shrines." (S. 6). Weiter werden Fragen nach den Motiven für Wallfahrten und den Gründen für unterschiedliche – regionale oder überregionale – Einzugsgebiete der Kulte erörtet. Die weitreichende soziale und politische Bedeutung, die heilige Bezirke besaßen, wird allein dadurch deutlich, daß durch neu geschaffene Märtyrerstätten, übernommene Kultkomplexe oder mit Legenden bedachte Stätten (Reise der hl. Familie) gleichzeitig das Renommee von Orten gefördert wurde.

Im zweiten Teil des Buches über einheimische Traditionen werden von Y. Volokhine in "Les déplacements pieux en Égypte pharaonique: sites et pratiques cultuelles" Kultstätten aus dynastischer Zeit vorgestellt, unter denen einige Zentren mit überregionaler Bedeutung wie der Bereich von Memphis oder Abydos besondere Beachtung erfahren. Pilgerreisen im engeren Sinne, die ein Individuum aus religiöser Motivation aus einer lokalen Ära hinaus-

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

führen, besitzen keine Bedeutung, da die Ortskulte eine wichtigere Rolle spielten. Hingegen lassen sich viele christlich-religiöse Verhaltensweisen, wie die Frömmigkeit am Grabe einer verehrungswürdigen Person oder die Inkubation, auf alte Traditionen zurückführen. A. Kerkeslager geht in "Jewish Pilgrimage and Jewish Identity in Hellenistic and Early Roman Egypt" schwerpunktmäßig auf die Frage nach der jüdischen Identität im griechisch-römischen Ägypten und ihrem Ausdruck im Pilgertum ein. Die beschriebenen jüdischen Traditionen (Pilgerreisen nach Jerusalem, Totenkult etc.) werden als mögliche Vorläufer für die christliche Wallfahrt eher negativ bewertet – bei der Formulierung der Ergebnisse werden Ähnlichkeiten hinter den Unterschieden zurückgesetzt. In einem sehr langen Teil des Artikels (S. 146–213) wird die Lokalisierung des Berges Sinai in verschiedenen jüdischen Quellen, beginnend mit der vorexilischen Periode, diskutiert.

Der dritte Teil des Buches bietet sechs Beiträge zu regionalen Pilgerstätten mit deutlichem Schwerpunkt im spätantiken Ägypten. Dabei thematisiert der Artikel "Island of the Extremity: Space, Language, and Power in the Pilgrimage Traditions of Philae" von I. Rutherford zu einem großen Teil noch die im vorigen Teil behandelten vorchristlichen Traditionen. Mit einem Hinweis auf die Interpretationsprobleme, die die Inschriften bieten (Unterscheidung von Pilgern oder Gelegenheitsbesuchern), wird über die Geschichte des Tempelkomplexes seit den Anfängen in der 25. Dynastie (die Isis-Verehrung begann unter Psammetich II. in der 26. Dynastie) referiert. Der geschichtliche Überblick, in dem auch die Grenzverschiebungen in römischer Zeit sowie die Rolle der Blemmyer und Nobaden behandelt werden, endet mit der Schließung des Isistempels in justinianischer Zeit, die zwischen den Jahren 535 bis 537 angesetzt werden kann und nicht „about 537" (S. 235; richtig dagegen auf S. 10, wo auch kurz auf die christliche Epoche der Insel verwiesen wird). Zur Dokumentation der Umwandlung sollte jedenfalls auf S. 235 Anm. 22 P. Grossmann, "Die Kirche des Bischofs Theodoros im Isistempel von Philae, Versuch einer Rekonstruktion", *RSO* 58 (1984) 107–117, hinzugezogen werden. Graffiti und Inschriften, die für die Frage nach dem Pilgertum relevant sind, werden zeitlich gegliedert, angefangen von der ptolemäischen Zeit bis zur post-meroitischen Phase. Dabei ergibt sich, daß es sich sowohl um offizielle als auch nicht-offizielle Besuche handelte, die nicht nur aus dem lokalen Bereich kamen. Nicht-inschriftliche Zeugnisse (Prokopius, Priscus) belegen die Nutzung der Tempel von Philae durch die Nobaden und Blemmyer. Insgesamt kann so für mehrere Epochen von Philae als Pilgerstätte gesprochen werden.[1] Der Beitrag enthält leider, überwiegend bei der Zitierung deutscher Titel,

viele Druckfehler (S. 232–234 Anm. 10: „ptolemäischer" statt „ptolemäische"; Anm. 11: „seine" statt „sei"; Anm. 12: „CdE 38 (1963)" statt „CE 43 (1968)"; Anm. 15: „einer" statt „eine"; Anm. 16: „Diocletianus" statt „Diocletian"; S. 236 f. Anm. 25–30 sind elf Fehler, zumeist Umlaute zu zählen; etc.).

D. Montserrat behandelt in "Pilgrimage to the Shrine of SS Cyrus and John at Menouthis in Late Antiquity" das neben der Menasstadt zweite große Pilgerzentrum im Norden Ägyptens. Die aufschlussreiche Erörterung der Datierungsmöglichkeiten zeigt, daß der Kult der Märtyrer Kyros und Johannes wahrscheinlich bereits in den 20-er Jahren des 5. Jh. als Alternative zum bestehenden heilkräftigen Isiskult eingerichtet wurde und bis zum 9. Jahrhundert bestehen blieb. Bei der Auswertung der Informationen von Sophronius können sowohl das Heiligtum näher beschrieben als auch interessante Beobachtungen zu Heilungen zusammengetragen werden.

In "The Pilgrimage Center of Abû Mînâ" wird von P. Grossmann die sakrale und profane Baugeschichte des berühmten Pilgerheiligtums sowie der außerhalb der Stadt liegenden Gebäude komprimiert beschrieben (mit vier Plänen und fünf Tafeln). Ausgehend von einem paganen Hypogaeum, das die sterblichen Überreste des Heiligen bewahrt haben sollte, wurde nach dem Bau eines einfachen Kenotaphs und eines Mausoleums ein Komplex aus mehreren Bauten (Gruftkirche, Querschiffbasilika etc.) errichtet. Es entfaltete sich eine Gesamtanlage mit Stadtmauer, Herbergen, Bädern, Läden usw. Die Interpretation des archäologischen Befundes ermöglicht viele Rückschlüsse auf die Märtyrerverehrung. So kann nicht nur eine Vorstellung von der Ölweihung (S. 285), dem Pilgeransturm (S. 286) oder dem Repräsentationscharakter der kollonierten Prachtstraße (S. 287) gewonnen, sondern auch auf eine Anlage für die Inkubation (S. 288) geschlossen werden. Während die Ostkirche mit den anliegenden Eremitagen das Zentrum eines monastischen Verbundes gebildet haben könnte, schließt der Autor aus der architektonischen Gestaltung der Nordbasilika (u.a. westlicher Umgang und drei Altarnischen in einer Kapelle), daß sie der monophysitischen Kirche angehörte, während die Stadt selbst unter chalkedonensischer Verwaltung gestanden haben soll. Nach einer persischen Zerstörung (bei der Datierung in das Jahr 619 wird angenommen, daß sie im gleichen Jahr wie die Eroberung Alexandriens stattfand) und der arabischen Eroberung Ägyptens gelangte der Ort noch einmal unter monophysitischer Regentschaft zu einer Nachblüte, in der die Gruftkirche als fünfschiffige Basilika wiedererrichtet wurde.

S.J. Davis beschäftigt sich in "Pilgrimage and the Cult of Saint Thecla in Late Antique Egypt" mit der Darstellung der heiligen Thekla auf eini-

gen Menasampullen (nach seiner Liste sind bislang 16 publiziert; im Anhang zwei Tafeln). Unter den vermuteten Gründen für die Zusammenstellung mit Menas nennt er Gemeinsamkeiten in den Legenden und die Möglichkeit, daß ein weibliches Pendant als Vorbild für weibliche Pilger dienen sollte. Überdies verweist er auf die Erwähnung eines Martyrion der Thekla in einem Menaswunder (J. Drescher, *Apa Mena*, Kairo 1946, S. 116 f. Nr. 4). Eine solche Stätte ist nur in den Überlieferungen dieses Wunders erwähnt, archäologisch noch nicht nachgewiesen, aber durch den Befund auf den Menasampullen in Betracht zu ziehen. In einer arabischen Version, die vom Autor nicht beachtet wurde, wird ein Ort namens at-Tûm genannt, in dem sich ein der Thekla geweihtes Gotteshaus befunden haben soll, s. F. Jaritz, *Die arabischen Quellen zum Heiligen Menas*, Heidelberg 1993, S. 168 f., 218 f. Nr. 9. Die Behandlung des Menaswunders erscheint sehr spekulativ. So wird aus der Erzählung, daß in der Nähe des Thekla-Schreins eine bedrohte Frau namens Sophia vom heiligen Menas gerettet und zu seiner eigenen Stätte gebracht wird, auf eine Art Konkurrenzkampf zwischen den beiden Heiligtümern geschlossen (S. 322). Dabei wird außer acht gelassen, daß im Wunder ausdrücklich steht, daß sich die Frau auf den Weg zum Menasheiligtum befindet und wie in anderen Wundern (Drescher, *op. cit.*, S. 118 f. Nr. 15) folgerichtig durch das Eingreifen des Heiligen vor einer Vergewaltigung bewahrt wird. Das Menaswunder kann zwar als Hinweis auf die Existenz einer Thekla-Stätte genannt werden, aber auch wegen gattungskritischer Bedenken darüber hinaus kaum als Indiz für eine besondere Anziehung derselben auf pilgernde Frauen in Ägypten dienen.

In dem Aufsatz von H. Behlmer, "Visitors to Shenoute's Monastery" werden verschiedene Nachrichten über Besuche im Weißen Kloster strukturiert zusammengestellt und wird hinterfragt, ob von einem Pilgertum die Rede sein kann. Für Besuche von Philosophen und anderen Nichtchristen, leitenden Beamten, Mönchen etc. können unterschiedliche Gründe angeführt werden, die von einer Wunder- und Heilssuche in der Nähe eines heiligen Mannes über die Suche nach einem Gespräch bis hin zu diplomatischen Absichten reichen. Das Kloster und die Persönlichkeit Schenutes bildeten offensichtlich einen Anziehungspunkt aus weltlicher und spiritueller Macht. Je nach Definition kann die Bezeichnung als Pilger für verschiedene Kategorien von Besuchern verwendet werden.

Mit dem Beitrag von I. Shahîd, "Arab Christian Pilgrimages in the Proto-Byzantine Period (V–VII Centuries)" wird die ägyptische Landschaft verlassen und über Pilgerstätten von christlichen Arabern berichtet, die im Heiligen Land, auf dem Sinai, Kleinasien, Mesopotamien und in Südarabien

lagen. Der Aufstieg des Islam, verknüpft mit den weltlichen Eroberungen, bedeutete den Anfang vom Ende vieler christlich-arabischer Pilgerheiligtümer.

Der vierte Teil des Buches handelt über die Riten koptischer Pilger. L. Papini, "Fragments of the *Sortes Sanctorum* from the Shrine of St. Colluthus" veröffentlicht zwei Fragmente eines koptischen Pergament-Codex mit Orakelsprüchen, die bereits 1937 in Antinoupolis gefunden wurden (bei der Literaturangabe in Anm. 6 handelt es sich um den Sonderband von *Enchoria* 8). Mit dem Beitrag wird eindrücklich die Fortsetzung der traditionellen ägyptischen Orakelbräuche in der koptischen Märtyrerverehrung demonstriert. L.S.B. MacCoull trägt in ihrem Artikel "Chant in Coptic Pilgrimage" eine Vielzahl von narrativen Quellen für Musik und Gesang zusammen. Da älteres Material nicht erhalten ist, werden einige Hymnen aus dem Difnar angeführt, die als Pilgergesang in Frage kommen. J. Timbie, "A Liturgical Procession in the Desert of Apa Shenoute" versucht die Stationen einer Prozession, bekannt durch einen liturgischen Text mit dem Titel „Das ist der Ritus des Festes der Wüste des Apa Schenute (am) Montag der zweiten Woche der heiligen vierzig Tage" zu rekonstruieren (überliefert in der wahrscheinlich aus dem 15./16. Jh. stammenden trilingualen Handschrift Bibl. Nat. Paris Nr. 68). Dabei werden u.a. die Thesen vertreten, daß es sich bei der ⲧⲕⲉⲗⲍⲉ ⲙⲡⲥϩⲓ (allgemein „Ecke" des Schreibers, Lehrers oder Meisters) um die Ecke des Vorsängers oder Chorleiters handelt und mit dem Begriff θάλασσα ein Schrein mit den sterblichen Überresten Schenutes benannt wird, der sich in der „Kirche ⲉⲧⲣⲓⲥⲁⲙⲟⲩ" befindet. Bei dieser Auffassung fragt es sich, warum die Reihe von Schlüsselwörtern des Textes, die sich tatsächlich auf den Themenkreis „Wasser" beziehen (S. 432), hier für die Interpretation außer acht gelassen werden, während sie an anderer Stelle den Themenkreis „Abend/Nacht" berühren und gleich auf die Tageszeit der Prozession deuten sollen (S. 436). Die Rekonstruktion ist insgesamt ein ernstzunehmender Vorschlag, der in einigen Teilen nicht sicher beweisbar ist, so daß er mit den noch etwas vorsichtigeren Aussagen von H. Quecke, *Untersuchungen zum koptischen Stundengebet*, Louvain 1970, S. 488 ff. in eine Reihe gestellt werden kann.

Im 5. Teil des Bandes beschäftigt sich der Beitrag von D. Brakke, "'Outside the Places, within the Truth': Athanasius of Alexandria and the Localization of the Holy" mit den Gründen für die ablehnende Haltung des Bischofs gegenüber der Heiligenverehrung, wofür er u. a. Stellen aus der *Vita* des Antonius, einen fragmentarischen Brief (PG 26.1189–90) und die Festbriefe Nr. 41 und 42 zu Rate zieht. Mit Pilgerreisen zum Mönchtum

in Ägypten und ihrer schriftlichen Niederlegung befaßt sich G. Frank, "Miracles, Monks, and Monuments: The *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* as Pilgrims' Tales". Mit literaturwissenschaftlichen Fragestellungen wird versucht, die *Historia Monachorum* als Reiseliteratur zu verstehen. In diesem Rahmen werden nicht nur Fragen zur Perspektive eines reisenden Autors, sondern auch zur Aufnahme des Berichtes durch das Publikum erörtert, das mittels solcher Literatur nicht nur in eine exotische Ferne schweifen, sondern das Ideal eines heiligen Lebens in Raum und Zeit imaginativ erleben konnte.

Den Abschluß bilden ein Index sowie der Karten- und Tafelteil. In seiner Gesamtheit vermag der Band mit seinen qualitätvollen Beiträgen dem Leser ein Spiegelbild der Vielfältigkeit und traditionellen Einbindung spätantiken Pilgertums und christlicher Bräuche in Ägypten zu geben.

D-48143 *Münster*, SIEGFRIED RICHTER
Institut für Ägyptologie & Koptologie
Schlaunstraße 2

[1] Über die Fortsetzung der religiösen Bedeutung im Christentum (belegt durch mindestens drei Tempelumwandlungen, drei Kirchenneubauten und einer Übernahme der Titulatur der Isis als Herrin von Philae) s. S.G. Richter, *Studien zur Christianisierung Nubiens. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus*, Reichert-Verlag, Wiesbaden (im Druck).

J. N. Bremmer (Ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter. Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism* (Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 3). Leuven, Peeters, 1998. 213 S., BEF 1370.-, ISBN 90-429-0019-9.

Mit dem vorliegenden Band wird eine Reihe fortgesetzt, die sich einer engen Kooperation zwischen der Reichsuniversität Groningen, der Károli Gáspár Universität und der Loránd-Eötvös-Universität Budapest verdankt: Im Rahmen dieser niederländisch-ungarischen Zusammenarbeit finden seit 1991 jährliche Konferenzen zu einzelnen apokryphen Apostelakten statt; Veröffentlichungen zu den Johannes-Akten (1995) und den Paulus-Akten (1996) sind bereits erschienen, und dem hier anzuzeigenden Band folgte jüngst einer zu den Andreas-Akten (2000). Die drei Stichworte des Untertitels zeigen die Schwerpunkte an, denen sich die fünfzehn Beiträge des Bandes widmen. Abgeschlossen wird er mit einer nützlichen Bibliographie zu den Petrus-Akten von P. J. Lalleman und J. N. Bremmer (S. 200-202) und einem Stichwortindex.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Der einleitende Aufsatz des Herausgebers („Aspects of the *Acts of Peter*: Women, Magic, Place and Date", S. 1-20) kann als eine Art von Einleitung in die Thematik des ganzen Bandes gelesen werden: Bremmer stellt zunächst unter der Überschrift „Women" die schroff enkratischen Tendenzen der Passagen aus dem Berliner koptischen Papyrus heraus – wobei man sich die schöne Szene, in der die Frau des Petrus und ihre wunderschöne Tochter beim Baden beobachtet werden, durchaus nicht nur in Kleinasien (so Bremmer, S. 2) vorstellen kann, sondern auch in Palästina, wie einschlägige rabbinische Quellen und der archäologische Befund deutlich machen. Bremmer verbindet eine kleinteilige Analyse und Kommentierung von Passagen mit einer grundlegenden Einführung in Tendenzen der Texte (so beispielsweise zu mart. Petr. 5 = act. Petr. 34 τοῦ Καίσαρος φίλου = *amici Caesaris*; die Kritik an der Übersetzung trifft nur die englische Übersetzung von Schneemelcher, vgl. NTApo II, 285). Bei dieser Kommentierung der Passagen sammelt er zudem bereits Indizien dafür, daß die Akten in Kleinasien und nicht in Rom entstanden sind; eines seiner Argumente stellt eben die Ehrenbezeugung *amicus Caesaris* dar (S. 6), ein weiteres der intendierte historische Rückbezug, der durch die Personennamen gesetzt wird (S. 15-19). Mehr als – freilich recht starke – Indizien sind es auch nicht; so steht eben im Hintergrund von act. Petr. 28 ein typisch *römisches* Begräbnis (so auch Bremmer, S. 14f.).

Durch seine überaus gründliche Kommentierung einzelner Passagen gelingt es Bremmer auch, die Texte im Rahmen einer allgemeinen antiken Religions- und Kulturgeschichte zum Sprechen zu bringen. Eine solche Form der Kommentierung verlockt aber natürlich, weitere Texte und Literatur nachzutragen:

> Zu der „schwarzen, in schmutzige Lumpen gehüllten (Person)", von der der Senator Marcellus träumt (act. Petr. 22), hätte Bremmer neben dem, was S. 8f. schon genannt ist, auf den schönen Exkurs „Der Schwarze" bei P. Habermehl, Perpetua und der Ägypter oder Bilder des Bösen im frühen afrikanischen Christentum. Ein Versuch zur *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (TU 140), Berlin 1992, 145-160 verweisen können, in der die Stelle aus den Akten ausführlich besprochen wird (S. 154-157); für die Akklamation *tu Romanorum salvator* (act. Petr. 4) auf die Debatte über die Herkunft dieses Wortes, wie sie jetzt M. Wellstein, Nova Verba in Tertullians Schriften gegen die Häretiker aus montanistischer Zeit (BzA 127), Stuttgart und Leipzig 1999, 177-180 zusammengefaßt hat – schließlich ist die Datierung der lateinischen Übersetzung des ursprünglich griechischen Textes kontrovers (S. 18f.). Für die Verbindung dieser Übersetzung mit den Manichäern, die Bremmer zunächst nur aus chronologischen Gründen ausschließt (S. 18f.), könnte man mit Carl Schmidt, Studien zu den alten Petrusakten, ZKG 43 (1924), (320-348) 332-342 auf Augustinus-Texte hinweisen (z.B. Aug., Adim. 17,5; vgl. auch im Beitrag von G.H. Poupon, S. 196f.). Natürlich gibt es auch pagane wie christliche

Parallelen für die Erzählung von der Wiederbelebung eines toten Fisches, über die sich Bremmer etwas verwundert (act. Petr. 13, Bremmer S. 12): J. Engemann, Art. Fisch, RAC VII, 1969, (959-1097) 1011. 1041f. In jedem Falle würde man angesichts solcher verheißungsvoller Proben gern einen regelrechten Kommentar aus der Hand von Bremmer lesen!

Eine Reihe von Beiträgen beschäftigen sich mit kleinteiligeren Themata: I. Karasszon, „Agrippa, King and Prefect", S. 21-28; P. Herczeg, „*Theios aner*: Traits in the Apocryphal *Acts of Peter*" (S. 29-38); ein größeres Thema jeder Beschäftigung mit den *Acta* ist natürlich Simon Magus: G. Luttikhuizen behandelt „Simon Magus as a Narrative Figure in the Acts of Peter" (S. 39-51); T. Adamik „The Image of Simon Magus in the Christian Tradition" (S. 52-64). Ob es wirklich sinnvoll ist, die Frage nach „Simon's teaching" (S. 54-62) ohne jeden Hinweis auf die Debatte zwischen Beyschlag und Lüdemann und Rudolphs entschiedene Parteinahme zu verhandeln (K. Rudolph, „Simon – Magus oder Gnosticus? Zum Stand der Debatte", ThR 42 [1977], 279-359)? Es wäre auch schön gewesen, Leser auf die bequemen Möglichkeiten hinzuweisen, sich über den Stand der Samaritanerforschung zu orientieren: A.D. Crown (Ed.), The Samaritans, Tübingen 1989; ders., A Bibliography of the Samaritans, Metuchen, NJ u.a. ^{2}1993. Eine wirkliche Auseinandersetzung mit den Thesen von Josef Frickel zur „Apophasis Megale" findet nicht statt, er ist auch „Fickel" geschrieben. Mit der Kreuzigung Petri beschäftigen sich J. Bolyki, „‚Head Downwards': The Cross of Peter in the Lights of the Apocryphal Acts, of the New Testament and of the Society-transforming Claim of Early Christianity", S. 111-122 und M. Pesthy, „Cross and Death in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles", S. 123-133 (Bolyki deutet die Haltung Petri am Kreuz als Hinweis auf das Selbstverständnis des Autors und das gesellschaftskritische Programm des zeitgenössischen Christentums überhaupt, aber hier hätte ein Hinweis auf die zeitgenössische Strafrechtspraxis gut getan: M. Hengel, „Crucifixion", in: ders., The Cross of the Son of God, London 1986, [91-185] 125-130). Liuwe H. Westra widmet sich „*Regulae fidei* and Other Credal Formulations in the *Acts of Peter*" (S. 134-147) und expliziert an den Texten die bekannte Einsicht, daß diese freien *regula-fidei*- Formulierungen nicht als Zitate aus später fixierten festen Glaubensbekenntnissen interpretiert werden dürfen, sondern als Formulierungen sui generis wahrgenommen werden müssen. Westra ordnet diese Formulierungen nach Typenbezeichnungen, die er von P. Smulders übernommen hat („dyadic", „monarchical" usf.). Eine besondere Pointe seiner Untersuchung ist die m.E. zutreffende Beobachtung, daß die Verwendung von dyadischen Formeln nicht als Hinweis darauf genom-

men werden darf, daß der Autor einer Schrift eine Konzeption vertritt, für die deutsche Forscher den unglücklichen Begriff „Binitarismus" geprägt haben (S. 141f.).

Neben solchen geistes- und kulturgeschichtlichen Beiträgen finden sich auch zwei literaturwissenschaftliche Zugänge zu den Texten, die neuere Paradigmata wie „Intertextualität" und „the challenge-response game" mit Gewinn auf das einschlägige Material anwenden: C. M. Thomas, „Revivifying Resurrection Accounts: techniques of composition and rewriting in the *Acts of Peter* cc. 25-28", S. 65-83; I. Czachesz, „Who is Deviant? Entering the Story-World of the *Acts of Peter*", S. 84-96.

Zwei Aufsätze schließlich gelten eher philologischen Fragen: A. Hilhorst („The Text of the *Actus Vercellenses*", S. 148-160) informiert zunächst in knapper Form über die Vorgeschichte und die ratio der editio princeps dieses Textes durch Lipsius in den AAA, die er als „excellent edition" anspricht (S. 150). Auch die Ausgabe von Léon Vouaux wird besprochen. Ich nutze die Gelegenheit dieser Rezension, darauf hinzuweisen, daß im Zusammenhang der Neukollation des *Vercellensis* für die Berliner Ausgabe der Pseudo-Clementinen auch eine Neuausgabe der act. Petr. intendiert war und entsprechende Materialien in der Arbeitsstelle „Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller" der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie liegen, die gern zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Der Artikel schließt mit wertvollen Bemerkungen zu vierzehn problematischen Passagen (S. 154-160). Ergänzt wird der Beitrag durch Beobachtungen von G. H. Poupon, deren Hauptthese bereits durch den Titel angezeigt wird: „L'Origine africaine des *Actus Vercellenses*" (S. 192-199). Die Argumentation dafür basiert auf der besonderen Art, in der das explicit des Manuskriptes formuliert ist.

Wer sich über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung zu den act. Petr. orientieren will, ist also gut beraten, diesen Band nicht nur zu konsultieren, sondern seine Beiträge gründlich zu studieren.

D-69117 *Heidelberg*, Wissenschaftlich-theologisches Seminar, Kisselgasse 1 CHRISTOPH MARKSCHIES

BOOKS RECEIVED

Arnobius the Younger: *Arnobii Iunioris, Praedestinatus qui dicitur*, cvra et stvdio F. Gori (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, XXV B), Turnhout: Brepols 2000, xxii + 135 pp., ISBN 2-503-00256-0, EUR 62 (pb).

Augustine, *De bono coniugali; De sancta virginitate*. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Notes by P.G. Walsh (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford: Clarendon Press 2001, xxxv + 164 pp., ISBN 0-19-826995-1, £ 35.00 (cloth with book jacket).

Bähnk, Wiebke, *Von der Notwendigkeit des Leidens. Die Theologie des Martyriums bei Tertullian* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 78), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 2001, 355 S., ISBN 3-525-55186-X, DM 118,– (Geb.).—A thorough analysis of Tertullian's rigorist theology and interpretation of martyrdom in the context of the conflicts in Carthage. Later, bishop Cyprian, while drawing on Tertullian's theology, comes to view martyrdom as an 'unbloody' and 'daily' part of Christian life.

Basser, Herbert W., *Studies in Exegesis. Christian Critiques of Jewish Law and Rabbinic Responses 70-300 C.E.* (The Brill Reference Library of Ancient Judaism 2), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xiv + 148 pp., ISBN 90-04-11848-9, NLG 158,67 / US $ 89 (bound).

DeConick, April D., *Voices of the Mystics. Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series 157, Sheffield Academic Press 2001, 191 pp., ISBN 1-184127-190-X, UK £ 31.50 / US $ 52.50 (cloth with book jacket).

DIADOCH. *Revista de estudios de filosofía platónica y cristiana*. Vol. 2, N° 1-2, 1999. Instituto de Filosofía, Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago / Departamento de Filosofía, Universidad Argentina John F. Kennedy, Buenos Aires. ISSN 0717-4292, Chile $ 3.500 / Argentina $ 8 / Extranjero US $ 18 (incluido fleto aéreo).—Studies on e.g. Athanasius, Plotinus and the Gnostics, Maximus Confessor, Augustine, Origen.

Dill, Ueli & Beat R. Jenny (mit einem Beitrag von Alfred R. Weber), *Aus der Werkstatt der Amerbach-Edition. Christoph Vischer zum 90. Geburtstag* (Schriften der Universitätsbibliothek Basel, Band 2), Basel: Schwabe & Co. AG 2000, 483 S. (inkl. 11 Abb.), ISBN 3-7965-1087-6, SFr 58 / DM 68 / ÖS 490 (Leinen mit Schutzumschlag).—Important source material about the famous printer's and editor's family of Amerbach, well known for its many patristic editions. With significant information on e.g. Erasmus.

Duval, Yvette, *Chrétiens d'Afrique à l'aube de la paix constantinienne. Les premiers échos de la grande persécution* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 164), Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes 2000 [Diffuseur exclusif: Brepols, Turnhout, Belgium], 524 p. + 11 figures, ISBN 2-85121-181-1, FF 300 / EUR 45,73 (pb).

Ferdi, Sabah, *Augustin de retour en Afrique 388-430. Repères archéologiques dans le patrimoine algérien*, Tipasa, Algérie: Musée de Tipasa / Fribourg, Suisse: Éditions universitaires 2001, 176 pp., ISBN 2-8271-0895-X (cloth bound).

Fontaine, Jacques, *Isidore de Séville. Genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths*, Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 486 pp. + carte + maintes figures, ISBN 2-503-50955, EUR 32 (pb).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

Frankfurter, David, *Religion in Roman Egypt. Assimilation and Resistance*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 2001, xvi + 314 pp., ISBN 0-691-07054-7, $ 16.95 / £ 10.50 (pb).—Detailed examination of the impact of Christianity on classical Egyptian society under Roman rule; exploration of the complex acceptance of Christianity by the Egyptian people in the Byzantine period; first paperback edition of an acclaimed book (1st ed. 1998).

Haines-Eitzen, Kim, *Guardians of Letters. Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*, Oxford University Press USA: Oxford-New York 2000, x + 212 pp., ISBN 0-19-513564-4, £ 34,50 (cloth with jacket).

Hieronymus: *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*, Opera III, Opera Polemica 4, *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*, edidit A. Canellis (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, LXXIX B), Turnhout: Brepols 2000, XII + 137* (Introduction) + 104 pp., ISBN 2-503-00796-1, EUR 97 (pb).

Horrell, David G. & Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Christology, Controversy and Community. New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 99), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xxi + 404 pp., ISBN 90-04-11679-6, DFL 189,52 / US $ 106 (clothbound with book jacket).—'. . . represent a range of approaches and topics, connected together by a focus on various kinds of christological claim, whether by the historical Jesus, in the Q tradition, John, Paul or the synoptics, and their connection with controversy and the construction of early Christian community'.

Isidore of Sevilla: *Isidori Hispalensis Versus*, cura et studio José María Sánchez Martín (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, CXIII A), Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 274 pp., ISBN 2-503-01134-9, EUR 144 (pb).

Jackson-McCabe, Matt A., *Logos and Law in the Letter of James. The Law of Nature, the Law of Moses, and the Law of Freedom* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 100), Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill 2000, xvi + 281 pp., ISBN 90-04-11994-9, DFL 178,50 / US $ 100 (clothbound with book jacket).—'. . . argues that James understands the Torah to be a written expression of the divine law the Stoics correlated with human reason'. With extensive discussion of, e.g., Philo, *4 Maccabees*, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and Justin Martyr's *Second Apology*.

Lubac, Henri de, *Medieval Exegesis. The Four Senses of Scripture*. Volume I, translated by Marc Sebanc, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1998, xxiv + 466 pp., ISBN 0-8028-4145-7, US $ 45.00 (pb); Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis. The Four Senses of Scripture*. Volume II, translated by E.M. Macierowski, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2000, xiii + 439 pp., ISBN 0-8028-4146-5, US $ 45.00 (pb).—Originally published in French as *Exegèse médiévale*, Henri de Lubac's study of medieval exegesis has remained one of the most significant works of modern scholarship. It is a kind of encyclopedia of patristic and medieval exegesis of the Scriptures. Foreword by Robert Louis Wilken.

Lüdemann, Gerd (Hrsg.), *Studien zur Gnosis* (Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums, Band 9), Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern etc.: Peter Lang 1999, 287 S., ISBN 3-631-34331-0, SFR 64,– (pb).—Drei Aufsätze: (1) Gerd Lüdemann, 'Die Apostelgeschichte und die Anfänge der simonianischen Gnosis' (7-20); Martina Janßen, 'Mystagogus Gnosticus? Zur Gattung der »gnostischen Gespräche des Auferstandenen«' (21-260!); Roald A. Zellweger, 'Das Mandäerproblem im Lichte des frühen syrischen Christentums' (261-287).

Markschies, Christoph, *Alta Trinità Beata. Gesammelte Studien zur altkirchlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2000, XI + 333 S., ISBN 3-16-147298-5, DM 128,–

(Fadengeheftete Broschur).—Seven studies, partly revised and expanded, by a leading patristic scholar: (1) '«Sessio ad dexteram». Bemerkungen zu einem altchristlichen Bekenntnismotiv in der Diskussion der altkirchlichen Theologen'; (2) '«Die wunderliche Mähr von zwei Logoi . . .». Clemens Alexandrinus, Fragment 23 - Zeugnis eines *Arius ante Arium* oder des arianischen Streites selbst?'; (3) 'Theologische Diskussionen zur Zeit Konstantins. Arius, der «arianische Streit» und das Konzil von Nicaea, die nachnizänischen Auseinandersetzungen bis 337'; (4) 'Gibt es eine einheitliche «kappadozische Trinitätstheologie»? Vorläufige Erwägungen zu Einheit und Differenzen neunizänischer Theologie'; (5) 'Was ist lateinischer «Neunizänismus»? Ein Vorschlag für eine Antwort'; (6) 'Ambrosius als Trinitätstheologe'; (7) '« . . . et tamen non tres Dii, sed unus Deus . . .». Zum Stand der Erforschung der altkirchlichen Trinitätstheologie'. With 'Einleitung' and excellent indices.

Mosheim, Johann Lorenz von, *Versuch einer unpartheiischen und gründlichen Ketzergeschichte*, Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner 1995, xlv + 56 + 466 S., ISBN 3-927718-33-5, DM 78 (Halbleinen)—Reprint of the edition of Helmstedt 1746, with 'Einleitung' and 'Kommentierende Anmerkungen' by Dirk Fleischer. For students of patristics, Mosheim's second and main part on the gnostic sect of the Ophites still has its (restricted) value.

Orthodoxie, Christianisme, Histoire / Orthodoxy, Christianity, History, édité par Susanna Elm, Éric Rebillard et Antonella Romano (Collection de l'École française de Rome 270), Rome: École française de Rome 2000 [Diffusion en France: De Boccard, 11 Rue de Médicis, 75006 Paris], xxv + 404 pp., ISBN 2-7283-0591-9 (pb).—Results from the research group «Définir, maintenir et remettre en cause l'orthodoxie dans l'histoire du christianisme» (École française de Rome, University of California at Berkeley, with the support of the Fondation France-Berkeley). Case studies (in French and English) on e.g. Orthodox monasticism (Daniel Caner), Augustine of Hippo (Robert Dodaro), Gregory of Nazianze (Susanna Elm), Epiphanius of Salamis (Rebecca Lyman), the Pelagian controversy (Éric Rebillard), Theodoret of Cyrus (Helen Sillett), the Three Chapters controversy (Claire Sotinel), and an overview of 'Orthodoxie et hérésie aux premiers siècles dans l'historiographie récente' (Alain Le Boulluec).

Paulinus Nolanus: Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani, *Carmina; Indices Voluminum XXIX et XXX*, edidit Guilelmus de Hartel. Editio altera supplementis aucta curante Margit Kamptner (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum XXX), Vindobonae: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1999, XXXXIII + 638 S., ISBN 3-7001-2865-7 (broschiert).

Runia, David T. & Gregory E. Sterling (eds.), *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*. Vol. XII, 2000 (Brown Judaic Studies 328), Providence: Brown Judaic Studies 2000, viii + 241 pp., ISBN 1-930675-04-6, $ 34.95 (cloth).—J.R. Royse, 'The Text of Philo's *Legum Allegoriae*'; T.H. Tobin, 'The Beginning of Philo's *Legum Allegoriae*'; A. van den Hoek, 'Philo and Origen: a Descriptive Catalogue of their Relationship'; S. Étienne, 'Réflexion sur l'apostasie de Tibérius Julius Alexander'; D.T. Runia, 'Alexandria and Cambridge: James Kugel's *Traditions of the Bible*'; Bibliography; Reviews.

Strauß, David Friedrich, *Der Christus des Glaubens und der Jesus der Geschichte. Eine Kritik des Schleiermacher'schen Lebens Jesu*, neu herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Angelika Dörfler-Dierken und Jörg Dierken, Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner 2000, 45 + XII + 240 S., ISBN 3-933688-42-6, DM 28 (kartoniert).

Tertullien, *Contre Marcion*, Tome IV (Livre IV). Texte critique par Claudio Moreschini. Introduction, traduction et commentaire par René Braun (Sources Chrétiennes 456),

Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 2001, 545 p., ISBN 2-204-06585-4, FF 310 (broché).—'Ce livre constitue une mine précieuse d'informations concernant le marcionisme, sa doctrine et ses Écritures; il apporte en même temps un témoignage capital sur le texte et la traduction latine de l'Évangile, comme sur la réception de celui-ci, entre orthodoxie et hétérodoxie, dans le christianisme du début du IIIe siècle'.

Thiselton, Anthony C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary), Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans 2000, 1424 pp., ISBN 0-8028-2449-8, US $ 75.00 (hardcover with jacket).—'the most detailed and comprehensive commentary on the Greek text of 1 Cortinthians in English . . . with major issues of interpretation from the Church Fathers . . .'.

Trompf, G.W., *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice*, London & New York: Continuum 2000, XX + 362 pp., ISBN 0-8264-5294-9, £ 55.00 (hardback).

Turner, John D. & Ruth Majercik (eds.), *Gnosticism and Later Platonism. Themes, Figures, and Texts*, Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2000, xiii + 338 pp., ISBN 0-88414-035-0, US$ 44.95 (pb).—Ten indepth studies by leading scholars, edited in an exemplary way: Einer Thomassen, 'The Derivation of Matter in Monistic Gnosticism'; Kevin Corrigan, 'Positive and Negative Matter in Later Platonism: The Uncovering of Plotinus's Dialogue with the Gnostics'; Gregory Shaw, 'After Aporia: Theurgy in Later Platonism'; John D. Turner, 'Ritual in Gnosticism'; Kevin Corrigan, 'Platonism and Gnosticism. The Anonymous *Commentary* on the *Parmenides*: Middle or Neoplatonic?'; John D. Turner, 'The Setting of the Platonizing Sethian Treatises in Middle Platonism'; John F. Finamore, 'Iamblichus, the Sethians, and *Marsanes*'; John Peter Kenney, 'Ancient Apophatic Theology'; Michael A. Williams, 'Negative Theologies and Demiurgical Myths in Late Antiquity'; Frederic M. Schroeder, 'Aseity and Connectedness in the Plotinian Philosophy of Providence'. With a Bibliography and a List of Abbreviations.

Williams, J.P., *Denying Divinity. Apophasis in the Patristic Christian and Soto Zen Buddhist Traditions*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press 2000, vii + 249 pp., ISBN 0-19-826999-4, £ 40.00 (cloth with book jacket).—'. . . argues for a new understanding of what is meant by apophatic theology, supported by extensive analysis of the texts of Dionysius the Areopagite, St Maximus the Confessor, and Zen Master Dogen'.

Winkelmann, Friedhelm, *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit* (Berliner Byzantinistische Studien, Band 6), Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern etc.: Peter Lang 2001, xviii + 307 S., ISBN 3-631-37377-5, SFR 79,– (Leinen).

IRENÄUS UND DIE VALENTINIANISCHE SCHULE

ZUR *PRAEFATIO* VON *ADV. HAER.* 1*

VON

JENS HOLZHAUSEN

Das erste Buch seines Werkes "Gegen die Häresien" (adv. haer. 1, um 180 n. Chr. verfaßt) hat Irenäus von Lyon klar aufgebaut und in drei Teile gegliedert:[1]

1. Ein valentinianisches Lehrsystem (Kap. 1-9)
2. Die unterschiedlichen Lehren der Valentinianer (Kap. 11-21)
3. Der Stammbaum der Valentinianer (Kap. 23-31)

In den ersten neun Kapiteln referiert (und kommentiert) er ein valentinianisches System, das keinem bestimmten Autor zugewiesen wird (eingeführt durch das unbestimmte "sie sagen" etc.);[2] in Kap. 10 stellt er einen kurzen Abriß der kirchlichen Lehre dagegen. Die Kirche zeichne sich dadurch aus, daß sie an allen Orten "einen und denselben Glauben" (μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν) besitze (10,1), die Lehre der Valentinianer sei dagegen "unbeständig" (ἄστατος) (11,1). Aus dieser Behauptung ergibt sich der zweite Teil, in dem die Unterschiede der valentinianischen Lehren beschrieben werden, wobei auch hier eine Zusammenfassung der kirchlichen Wahrheit den Abschluß bildet (Kap. 22). Dieser zweite Teil ist einerseits nach Personen und andererseits thematisch angeordnet. Folgende sieben Personen oder Gruppen werden dargestellt: der Gründer Valentin (11,1), Sekundos (11,2), "ein weiterer berühmter Lehrer" (11,3), "eine andere Gruppe" (11,5), die Anhänger des Ptolemaios (οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, 12,1), "eine noch klügere Gruppe" (12,3) und schließlich Markos und seine Schüler (13,1-16,3).[3] In

* Ich danke meiner Frau, Ulrike Wagner-Holzhausen, für Diskussion und Korrektur dieses Aufsatzes.

[1] Ich zitiere nach A. Rousseau/L. Doutreleau, *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies, Livre I (Tome I-II)*, Paris 1979 (SC 263-4).

[2] Zur Zuschreibung dieses Systems an Ptolemaios s. unten S. 350.

[3] Zur Abgrenzung des Markos-Referats s. N. Foerster, *Marcus Magus* (WUNT 114), Tübingen 1999, 7ff.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

thematischer Hinsicht werden die Meinungsunterschiede der Valentinianer an ihrem Streit um den Erlöser (12,4) und ihren Lehren von der Erlösung (21,1-5) gezeigt:[4]

> ὅσοι γάρ εἰσι ταύτης τῆς γνώμης μυσταγωγοί, τοσαῦται καὶ ἀπολυτρώσεις.
>
> Wie viele Mystagogen dieser Lehre es gibt, so viele Erlösungen gibt es auch.

Die Abschnitte 17,1-2 über die valentinianische Sicht der Schöpfung und 18,1-20,3 über ihren Gebrauch der Schrift, besonders des Alten Testaments, stellen eher Nachträge zum ersten Teil dar; denn in ihnen hat Irenäus das Thema der Unterschiedlichkeit der Lehren aus dem Auge verloren.[5] Hatte er im ersten Teil in den Kapiteln 3,1-6 und 8,1-5 die ntl. Schriftbelege angeführt, so werden jetzt die von den Valentinianern herangezogenen "Prophetenworte" nachgereicht.

Überblickt man den gesamten zweiten Teil, ist festzustellen, daß der Bericht über Markos und seine Schüler genausoviel Raum einnimmt wie alle anderen Berichte zusammen. Neben Valentin, dem Gründer, und Markos, von dem Irenäus neben mündlichen Nachrichten u.a. sicherlich auch eine Originalquelle (14,1-16,2) benutzen konnte, nennt er nur zwei Namen (Sekundos und Ptolemaios' Schule); beide werden sehr knapp abgehandelt. In den thematischen Abschnitten werden nie konkrete Namen genannt, sondern Irenäus beschränkt sich auf die 3. Pers. Plural oder spricht von οἱ μέν—οἱ δέ, ἄλλοι, ἔνιοι und ähnlichem. Dieses Verfahren überrascht: Von einem Autor, der die Zerstrittenheit einer Schule darstellen möchte, erwartet man eher, daß er die unterschiedlichen Lehren zum Beweis seiner Behauptung bestimmten Lehrern zuweist. Noch auffälliger ist, daß er den in Kap. 11,3 ohne Namen genannten "berühmten Lehrer" in Kap. 15,1 als Markos identifiziert.[6] Irenäus gelingt es offensichtlich nicht (oder ist nicht daran interessiert), seinem Leser ein klares Bild von den unterschiedlichen Richtungen zu geben. Der Grund für diese Unklarheit dürfte auch in dem von Irenäus benutzten Quellenmaterial liegen. Erst dem aufmerksamen Leser wird deutlich, daß sich die Unterschiede im wesentlichen auf den Aufbau der göttlichen transzendenten Welt (Pleroma) und die Herkunft des Erlösers beziehen; anderes wird Irenäus' Quelle nicht geboten haben.

---

[4] In 21,1 fällt gleichsam rahmend noch einmal das Stichwort ἄστατος: Die Überlieferung der valentinianischen Erlösung sei "unbeständig".

[5] Einzig in 18,2 werden unterschiedliche Lehren die Anthropogonie betreffend erwähnt.

[6] Vgl. dazu Förster (A. 3), 14f. und 293ff.

Der dritte Teil des ersten Buches (Kap. 23-31) enthält den berühmten Stammbaum der Valentinianer, der mit Simon Magus anhebt: "Es war nötig, für alle sichtbar zu beweisen, daß die Valentinianer von solchen Müttern, Vätern und Vorvätern abstammen . . .".[7] Die Quelle dieses Teiles ist wahrscheinlich Justins verlorenes "Syntagma"; das Problem, in welcher Weise Irenäus diese Quelle bearbeitet hat, kann hier beiseite blieben.[8]

Blickt man nun auf die "praefatio" zu Beginn des Werkes, in der Irenäus den Inhalt und die Zielsetzung des ersten Buches beschreibt, so fällt zuerst auf, daß er den dritten Teil dieses Buches nicht ankündigt.[9] Dies mag seinen Grund darin finden, daß er sich bewußt ist, diesen Abschnitt von einem anderen Autor übernommen zu haben, und deshalb darin keine im Vorwort herauszustellende Leistung gesehen hat. Möglicherweise entstand der Plan, einen Stammbaum der Valentinianer anzufügen, auch erst, nachdem Irenäus das Prooimion verfaßt hatte.

Wichtiger ist die Beobachtung, daß Irenäus die ersten beiden Teile seines ersten Buches exakt ankündigt. Ich referiere die beiden entscheidenden Sätze in ihrer Hauptaussage (praef. 2):

1) ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην . . . μηνύσαι σοι, ἀγαπητέ, τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια . . .
2) καὶ, καθὼς δύναμις ἡμῖν, τήν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, . . ., ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς, συντόμως καὶ σαφῶς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν . . .

1) Ich hielt es für notwendig . . ., dir, mein Lieber, die wundersamen und tiefgründigen Mysterien kundzutun . . .
2) Und, soweit es in meiner Möglichkeit steht, werde ich die Lehrmeinung von denen, die jetzt Falsches lehren, . . ., die eine Blütenlese der Lehre Valentins darstellt, kurz und klar mitteilen . . .

---

[7] Iren. haer. 1,31,3: "a talibus matribus et patribus et proavis (sc. esse) eos, qui a Valentino sint, . . . necessarium fuit manifeste arguere . . ."; in der griechischen Vorlage vermutlich: ἐκ τοιούτων μητέρων τε καὶ πατέρων καὶ προγόνων ὄντας (oder γεγονότας) τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου . . . ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἐξελέγξαι; der lat. Übersetzer hat das wohl im gr. Original stehende Partizip ὄντας (oder γεγονότας) nicht eigens wiedergegeben. Rousseau/Doutreleau (A. 1), I 313-5 wollen "matribus" streichen; mit "matres und patres" sind aber m.E. die "Gnostiker" von Kap. 29-30 gemeint, wobei "Mütter" sich auf die weibliche Barbelo in Kap. 29 bezieht und "Väter" auf die Lehrer von Kap. 30 ("alii"); mit "Vorväter" sind Simon und die Simonianer gemeint; s. dazu meinen Aufsatz "Gnostizismus, Gnosis, Gnostiker" im JbAC 44, 2001.

[8] Dazu siehe z.B. den Forschungsüberblick bei W.A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule*, Tübingen 1996, 257ff.

[9] Anders im Rückblick auf das erste Buch im Prooimion des zweiten, wo er seinen Überblick über Simon und dessen Nachfolger herausstellt.

Irenäus kündigt zwei Arbeitsschritte an (durch καί verbunden), die durch die inhaltlich synonymen Verben μηνύειν und ἀπαγγέλλειν umschrieben werden:[10] In einem ersten Schritt will er die "Geheimnisse" seiner Gegner aufdecken. Diese Ankündigung bezieht sich offensichtlich auf den ersten Teil des ersten Buches, in dem Irenäus einen valentinianischen Systementwurf nachzeichnet. Die Richtigkeit dieser Zuordnung wird durch die Wiederholung des Ausdrucks τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια in Kap. 4,3 gesichert: an dieser Stelle nennt Irenäus die in Kap. 1-9 referierten kosmogonischen Lehren noch einmal "wundersame und tiefgründige Geheimnisse".[11]

Als zweiten Arbeitsschritt kündigt er im Vorwort an, sich "den jetzt Lehrenden" zu widmen. Mit diesem zweiten Schritt sind die Kapitel 11-21 gemeint, die nach den einführenden Bemerkungen über Valentin selbst seinen verschiedenen Nachfolgern gewidmet sind. Der Ausdruck "die jetzt Lehrenden" kann dabei nur im Kontrast zu dem "früher" lehrenden Valentin gemeint sein. Der Grund für die Tatsache, daß der Abschnitt über die "jetzt Lehrenden" dessen ungeachtet mit Valentin selbst beginnt, liegt darin, daß Irenäus das Kapitel, wie oben gezeigt, unter das Thema: "Uneinheitlichkeit der valentinianischen Lehren" stellt. Folgerichtig mußte auch Valentin selbst behandelt werden, da seine Lehre angesichts der Vielfalt der valentinianischen Systeme nur noch eine unter vielen ist.

Es fällt auf, daß Irenäus die verschiedenen Richtungen der Valentinianer mit dem singularischen Wort "Lehrmeinung" oder "Lehrgebäude" (γνώμη) bezeichnet.[12] Bei aller Unterschiedlichkeit der einzelnen Richtungen, die er breit herausstellt und kritisiert, sieht Irenäus dennoch die valentinianische Schule als Einheit. So vergleicht er in ironischem Ton die Lehren der Nachfolger mit einer Blütenlese (ἀπάνθισμα) aus Valentins mündlicher (und schriftlicher) Lehre,[13] d.h. die Schüler haben nach Irenäus im Garten ihres Schulhauptes die schönsten "Blüten" gepflückt und dann als die eigenen

---

[10] Er fügt an: καὶ ἀφορμὰς δώσομεν κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν μετριότητα πρὸς τὸ ἀνατρέπειν αὐτήν "und ich will in meiner Mittelmäßigkeit Anhaltspunkte geben für die Widerlegung ihrer Lehre". Dies ist kein eigener Teil, sondern geschieht fortlaufend als Kommentar nach dem Referat bestimmter Lehren. Die eigentliche Widerlegung beginnt mit Buch 2.

[11] Iren. haer. 1,4,3 ἀλλὰ ἀνακεχωρηκότα καὶ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια μετὰ πολλοῦ καμάτου περιγινόμενα τοῖς φιλοψευδέσι, vgl. auch 1,1,3 τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ καὶ ἀπόρρητα μυστήρια.

[12] Vgl. auch oben 21,1: ὅσοι γάρ εἰσι ταύτης τῆς γνώμης μυσταγωγοί κτλ.

[13] ἡ Οὐαλεντίνου σχολή meint hier nicht Valentins Schule als die Gruppe von Personen, die Valentin unterrichtet, sondern konkret das gesamte Produkt seiner wissenschaftlichen Beschäftigung, s. LSJ s.v. II 1: "learned discussion, disputation, lecture".

ausgegeben. Abgepflückte Blüten allerdings erfreuen sich nicht lange ihrer Schönheit, sondern verwelken (s. ἀπανθεῖν "verblühen"). Eine weitere florale Metapher kehrt am Ende des zweiten Teils wieder. Irenäus vergleicht dort die valentinianische Schule mit einem Baum und seinen vielen Verzweigungen (22,2):[14]

> . . . necessarium arbitrati sumus prius referre fontem et radicem eorum, ut . . . intellegas arborem, de qua defluxerunt tales fructus.
> . . . ich (Irenäus) hielt es für notwendig, zuerst über ihre Quelle und Wurzel zu informieren, damit man den Baum erkennt, von dem solche Früchte kommen.

Der Ausdruck "solche Früchte" bezieht sich auf den Inhalt der vorhergehenden Kap. 11-21 und meint die Lehren der verschiedenen Nachfolger Valentins ("Quelle und Wurzel" sind die angeblichen gnostischen Vorläufer Valentins, die von Simon Magus ausgehen).[15] Wie diese Lehren hier als "Früchte" bezeichnet werden, so nennt er sie im Vorwort "Blütenlese".[16] Von entscheidenden Differenzen zwischen Lehrer und Schülern verraten diese Bilder jedenfalls nichts. Irenäus betont im Vorwort die Schwierigkeit, diese unterschiedlichen Lehren darzustellen ("soweit es in meiner Möglichkeit steht"); auch dies dürfte ein Hinweis auf die Dürftigkeit oder Unklarheit des vorhandenen Quellenmaterials sein.

Soweit ist der Text des Vorworts gut verständlich und entspricht dem späteren Inhalt des ersten Buches. Dies trifft dagegen nicht auf den bisher ausgelassenen Halbsatz zu: . . . τήν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, **λέγω δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον**, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς κτλ. Die Gleichsetzung der "jetzt Lehrenden" mit "Ptolemaios' Anhängern" erstaunt.[17] Sollte Irenäus gemeint haben, daß alle im zweiten Teil genannten Lehrer (mit Ausnahme natürlich von Valentin) Ptolemaios' Schüler

---

[14] Vgl. Iren. adv. haer. 1,4,4: Irenäus imitiert valentinianische Lehren und resümiert: ἁρμόζουσι γὰρ τοιοῦτοι καρποὶ τῇ ὑποθέσει αὐτῶν.

[15] Denkt man den Vergleich zu Ende, ergibt sich, daß Valentin selbst den Stamm des Baumes darstellt.

[16] Vgl. Scholia in Pind. Ol. 3, 6g: ἀπάνθισμα, καρπόν· τῆς γὰρ αὐτῶν νίκης ὁ ὕμνος καρπός.

[17] Vgl. D. Wanke, Irenäus und die Häretiker in Rom, ZAC 3, 1999, 203f.: "Diese Angabe überrascht deshalb, weil die 'gegenwärtigen Falschlehrer', mit denen sich Irenäus in erster Linie auseinandersetzen müßte, gar nicht 'die um Ptolemäus' sind, sondern (ebenfalls) Valentinianer, die in der Nähe von Lyon aufgetaucht waren, sich auf den Magier Markos berufen und in den Gemeinden für derartige Unruhe gesorgt hatten, daß die Verunsicherung immer noch mit Händen zu greifen ist." Er zieht aus der Beobachtung allerdings andere Folgerungen, s. A. 24.

sind? Wohl nicht, denn weder Sekundos noch Markos noch irgend ein anderer werden im zweiten Teil (oder anderswo) so genannt.[18] Und wenn alle "jetzt Lehrenden" "Schüler des Ptolemaios" wären, ist es nicht einzusehen, warum dann Ptolemaios' Anhänger in Kap. 12,1 einzeln für sich besprochen werden;[19] diese Gruppe stellt nur eine unter den sieben in Kap. 11-21 genannten valentinianischen Richtungen dar, die weder zuerst behandelt wird, so daß alle anderen aus ihr abgeleitet würden, noch einen besonderen Stellenwert erhält (ihr ist kaum eine halbe Seite gewidmet); sie umfaßt nicht die Gesamtheit der "jetzt Lehrenden". Die Bemerkung ist also irreführend und sachlich unzutreffend. Es gibt keinen ersichtlichen Grund, warum Irenäus seine Leser im Vorwort fehlleiten sollte, indem er die "jetzt Lehrenden" auf Ptolemaios' Schule beschränkt, um dann neben dieser weitere (wenn auch z.T. unbenannte) Valentinianer zu besprechen, die er im Vorwort verschweigt (zumindest die Nennung des Markos, der die Hälfte des Raums einnimmt, würde man erwarten).[20] Der Halbsatz widerspricht zudem der oben herausgestellten Tendenz des Irenäus, Namen zu vermeiden (in der Praefatio wird sonst alleine der Name "Valentin" genannt). Weiterhin wird im Text nicht Ptolemaios' Schule als "Blütenlese"

---

[18] Iren. haer. 1,13,1: Markos rühmt sich, τοῦ διδασκάλου διορθωτής zu sein, kann sich m.E. nur auf Valentin beziehen, vgl. 1,11,1: ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης Γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας Οὐαλεντῖνος κτλ.; hier wird Valentin explizit ein διδασκαλεῖον zugeschrieben; vgl. 1,12,1 (nach Epiphan. haer. 33,1): οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος . . . ἔτι ἐμπειρότερος ἡμῖν τοῦ ἑαυτῶν διδασκάλου, auch hier ist "ihr Lehrer" Valentin.

[19] Iren. haer. 12,1 οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον ἐμπειρότεροι . . . λέγουσιν "die Anhänger des Ptolemaios, die mehr Erfahrung haben (als die in Kap. 11,5 genannte Gruppe), sagen . . ."; der Ausdruck οἱ περί τινα kann sowohl inklusiv (der übliche Gebrauch, s. LSJ s.v. περί C I 2): "Ptolemaios und seine Anhänger" als auch exklusiv: "Ptolemaios' Anhänger" (aber nicht Ptolemaios) gemeint sein, letzteres in adv. haer. 1,27,1 οἱ περὶ τὸν Σίμωνα (wo Simon selbst nicht gemeint ist). Diese Formulierung, die neben der genannten Simon-Stelle nur für Ptolemaios benutzt wird (Valentin, Sekundos und Markos werden mit einfachem Namen bezeichnet) scheint darauf zu deuten, daß Ptolemaios um 180 n. Chr. nicht mehr lebt (wahrscheinlich ist er der in Just. 2. Apol. 2,9 gemeinte Märtyrer, der um 152 n. Chr. starb, s. Wanke [A. 17], 207-11 mit Hinweis auf haer. 4,33,9, wo Irenäus zugeben muß, daß auch "ein oder zwei" Häretiker das Martyrium erlitten); nur Ptolemaios' Anhänger gehören also zu den "jetzt Lehrenden"; das bedeutet nicht, daß Irenäus auf inhaltlicher Ebene zwischen Ptolemaios und seinen Schülern unterscheiden wollte und konnte; er macht keine einzige Bemerkung in dieser Hinsicht, was er sicherlich getan hätte, wenn ihm Entsprechendes in seinen Quellen oder aus mdl. Informationen zu Gebote gestanden hätte; anders z.B. bei Markos und seinen Schülern, wo differenziert wird (s. Kap. 13,6). Insofern hat der Ausdruck οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον seinen einzigen Grund in der Tatsache, daß Ptolemaios nicht zu den "jetzt Lehrenden" gerechnet werden kann; insofern weicht Irenäus auf "Ptolemaios' Anhänger" aus.

[20] In Iren. haer. 2 prooem. 1 wird Markos jedenfalls explizit genannt.

der Lehre Valentins bezeichnet, sondern die Gesamtheit der jetzt Lehrenden (ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν bezieht sich auf τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων). Durch den Einschub des Ptolemaios entsteht der von manchen Interpreten[21] geteilte mißverständliche Eindruck, allein Ptolemaios' Schule stelle die "Blüte" dar, was schon aus grammatischen Gründen nicht zutrifft. Die Bemerkung über Ptolemäus' Schule muß als Erklärung für den unbestimmten Ausdruck: "die jetzt Falsches Lehrenden" in den Text geraten sein;[22] dafür bot sich der Name des berühmten Schülers an. Der Satz "ich meine die Schule des Ptolemaios" muß demgemäß als spätere Glosse aus dem Text des Irenäus gestrichen werden.[23] Irenäus' erstes Buch richtet sich gegen die valentinianische Schule als solche, nicht gegen eine bestimmte Richtung in ihr.[24]

Nach der Ankündigung des zweiten Teils im Vorwort soll nun die des ersten genauer betrachtet werden. Dieser Abschnitt ist besonders wichtig, weil Irenäus hier eine Angabe über die Quelle seiner Darlegungen macht:

> ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην ἐντυχὼν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν, ἐνίοις δ' αὐτῶν καὶ συμβαλὼν καὶ καταλαβόμενος τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν μηνύσαι σοι, ἀγαπητὲ, τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια . . .
>
> Nachdem ich auf Schriften von Leuten gestoßen bin, die, wie sie selbst sagen, Schüler Valentins seien, und auch mit einigen von ihnen zusammentraf und Kenntnis von ihrer Lehre erhielt, hielt ich es für notwendig, dir, mein Lieber, die wundersamen und tiefen Mysterien kundzutun . . .

---

[21] Vgl. z.B. D.J. Unger, *Irenaeus* (Ancient Christ. Writers 55), New York 1992, 22 übersetzt: "We are speaking of the disciples of Ptolemaeus, an offshoot of the Valentinian school"; M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism"*, Princeton 1996, 14: ". . . Ptolemy, whose doctrine Irenaeus refers to as the 'choice flower' of the Valentinian school"; Wanke (A. 17), 203: ". . . ich rede von denen um Ptolemäus, einem Ableger der Schule Valentins . . ."

[22] Die einzige Möglichkeit, die ich sehe, den Ausdruck im Text zu behalten, liegt darin, λέγω δή im Sinne von "ich meine z.B. die Schule des Ptolemaios" zu verstehen; einen Beleg dafür vermag ich nicht zu finden; folgende Stellen sprechen eher gegen eine solche Bedeutung: Aristeas ep. 233,2 λέγω δὴ οἷον θάνατοί τε καὶ νόσοι καὶ λῦπαι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, Hermias in Plat. Phaedr. 114,19 λέγω δὴ βουλήσεις καὶ δόξαι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, Philop. in Arist. Anal. post. CAG 13,3, 183,2: λέγω δὴ τὰ τετράγωνα τῆς σελήνης σχήματα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἄττα (hier liegt das "z.B." im τοιαῦτα).

[23] Sprachlich kann man als wichtiges Indiz werten, daß die Phrase λέγω δή nach TLG nur an dieser Stelle im Werk des Irenäus vorkommt.

[24] So Wanke (A. 17), der aus dem Vorwort folgert, Irenäus habe vor allem die römischen Anhänger des Ptolemaios im Auge. Überzeugend scheint mir die Ausrichtung des Werkes auf Rom als einem Zentrum der valentinianischen Schule, nicht aber die Verengung auf Ptolemaios' Schule; vgl. haer 2 prooem. 1: "in eo quidem libro, qui ante hunc est, . . . ostendimus tibi, dilectissime, omne ab his, qui sunt a Valentino, . . . falsiloquium."

Der entscheidende Auslöser für Irenäus' Werk lag offensichtlich in dem Auffinden von schriftlichen Zeugnissen der Gegner.[25] Er kann nun der an ihn gerichteten Bitte Folge leisten, die bislang verborgenen Lehren ans Licht zu ziehen.[26] In seinem Fund sieht er ein Geschenk der Gnade Gottes (χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ).[27] Nach Irenäus' Worten zu urteilen, war es sehr schwierig, originale Dokumente zu erhalten; sei es durch Zufall, sei es durch planmäßige Suche war es Irenäus aber gelungen, Texte (ὑπομνήματα) von Leuten zu finden, die sich als Valentin-Schüler ausgaben;[28] er habe (dann) mit einigen dieser Schüler persönlichen Kontakt aufgenommen und ihre Ansichten (auch mündlich) kennengelernt. Nun fühle er sich verpflichtet (ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην), die entdeckten Lehren der Öffentlichkeit mitzuteilen. Dieses Anliegen der Bekanntmachung ist ihm so wichtig, daß er seinen (namenlosen) Adressaten[29] sogar auffordert, seinerseits dies fortzuführen (ὅπως καὶ σὺ μαθὼν αὐτὰ πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ σοῦ φανερὰ ποιήσῃς).[30] Denn Irenäus ist überzeugt, daß allein die Kenntnis der für ihn abstrusen Lehren deren Widerlegung bedeutet (1,31,3):

> adversus eos victoria est sententiae eorum manifestatio.
> Der Sieg über sie besteht in der Offenlegung ihrer Lehre.

Aus dieser Interpretation ergibt sich, daß der Systementwurf, den Irenäus in den Kapiteln 1-9 bietet, aus schriftlichen Aufzeichnungen von Personen

---

[25] Anders Williams (A. 21), 45: "For Irenaeus is not really trying to show us what 'gnosticism' is, but what *heresy* is"; ich meine, richtiger wäre: "what Valentinian heresy is"; der Ketzerkatalog im dritten Teil soll lediglich die Wurzeln der Valentinianer aufdecken.

[26] Iren. haer. 3 prooem.: "Tu quidem, dilectissime, praeceperas nobis, ut eas quae a Valentino sunt sententias absconditas, ut ipsi putant, in manifestum proderem . . ."

[27] Von dem Adressaten seines Werkes behauptet Irenäus, er habe schon lange (und bisher vergeblich) die Lehren der Valentinianer kennenlernen wollen (haer. 1 prooem. 3). Ebenso hätten seine Vorgänger (Justin und Polykarp?) die valentinianischen Lehren nicht gekannt (haer. 4 prooem. 2).

[28] Es scheint nicht unwahrscheinlich, daß der Presbyter Florinus dabei eine gewisse Rolle spielte. In seiner Jugend sah Irenäus ihn in Kleinasien im Umkreis Polykarps; später muß Florinus valentinianische Lehren vertreten haben (s. Eus. H.E. 5,20); daß er selbst zu den "Schülern Valentins" gehört, kann man nicht annehmen, da Irenäus in seinem Brief an Florinus diesen von den "Häretikern außerhalb der Kirche" unterscheidet (H.E. 5,20,4); die "Schüler Valentins" standen für Irenäus sicherlich "außerhalb der Kirche".

[29] Nach G. Vallée, *A study in anti-Gnostic polemics*, Waterloo/Ontario 1981, 10 sei der Adressat fiktiv (gemeint sei die von den Häretikern verstörte Gemeinde). Wanke (A. 17), 236 lokalisiert ihn dagegen in Rom (evtl. der Presbyter und spätere Episcopus Viktor).

[30] Vgl. 1,15,5 (Z. 15-17) πειρασόμεθα . . . τὰ πολλῷ χρόνῳ κεκρυμμένα εἰς φανερὸν ἀγαγεῖν und 1,18,1 (Z. 9f.) ἀναγκαῖον μηνύσαντας τὸν ἔλεγχον αὐτοῖς ἐπάγειν.

stammt, die sich selbst als "Schüler Valentins" bezeichneten.[31] Die Zuverlässigkeit dieser Angabe betont er ausdrücklich: "wie sie selbst sagen" (ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν). Daß Irenäus aus ihm vorliegenden Texten exzerpiert, wird besonders in Kap. 8,5 deutlich: αὐταῖς λέξεσι λέγοντες οὕτως.[32] Diese "Schüler Valentins" hatten "Erinnerungsschriften" (ὑπομνήματα) angefertigt oder besaßen zumindest solche, ohne sie jedoch zu veröffentlichen.[33] Kenntnisnahme dieser Texte war nur durch persönliche Bekanntschaft möglich.[34] In Irenäus' Falle gelangten solche ὑπομνήματα nun einmal in die "falschen" Hände; er setzt sie einer breiteren Öffentlichkeit aus, um sie lächerlich zu machen. Über die Identität dieser Schüler verrät Irenäus nichts. Dabei gibt es keinen Grund, Irenäus' Angaben zu bezweifeln: Irenäus kann—wohl in Rom (dort weilte er spätestens 177/8 n. Chr., s. Eus. H.E. 5,4,2)—tatsächlich auf Leute gestoßen sein, die Valentins Predigten und Vorträge zwischen 140 und 150 n. Chr. (oder gar später) gehört haben und schriftliche Mitschriften verfaßten oder besaßen.[35] Die Unterscheidung der "Valentin-Schüler" von den "jetzt" tätigen Lehrern muß beachtet werden.[36] Aus ihr folgt erstens, daß die "Valentin-Schüler" keine Lehrer, son-

---

[31] Irenäus' Polemik in Kap. 4,3 legt nahe, daß Valentin wie ein nichtchristlicher Lehrer gegen Bezahlung unterrichtet hat. Vergleichbar sind die "Hypomnemata", die von Herakleons Johannes-Exegese angefertigt wurden, s. Orig. in Joh. 6,15,92; auch hier scheinen die "Schüler" abweichende Lehren notiert zu haben, s. ebd. 13,20,122 und 20,20,170.

[32] Vgl. adv. haer. 1,9,1 αὐτὰς παρεθέμην αὐτῶν τὰς λέξεις.

[33] Eine schöne Parallele gibt es in Porph. vit. Plot. 3 § 18-20: Plotin, Origenes und Herennius verabreden, ihre Unterlagen vom Unterricht des Ammonios Sakkas nicht zu veröffentlichen; Plotin hält sich 10 Jahre an die Verabredung und unterrichtet nur einige Schüler mündlich im Anschluß an Ammonios (ἐκ τῆς Ἀμμωνίου συνουσίας ποιούμενος τὰς διατριβάς); erst nachdem Herennius und Origenes etwas veröffentlicht haben, beginnt Plotin zu schreiben und damit die Lehren des Ammonios öffentlich zu machen.

[34] Vgl. F. Montanari, s.v. Hypomnema, Neuer Pauly 5, 1998, 813: "Die Konnotation 'Notiz privater Natur' rechtfertigt den Gebrauch des Wortes im Sinne einer nicht für die Verbreitung in der Öffentlichkeit bestimmten Schrift, im Gegensatz zu einem veröffentlichten Werk"; vgl. den Zeitgenossen Galen, de libris propriis 92,13-16 (Mueller, Galen Scrip. min. II) φίλοις γὰρ ἢ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδοτο (Subj.: meine Schriften) χωρὶς ἐπιγραφῆς ὡς ἂν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἔκδοσιν ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις γεγονότα δεηθεῖσιν, ὧν ἤκουσαν, ἔχειν ὑπομνήματα, dazu E. Nachmanson, *Der gr. Buchtitel*, Göteborg 1941, 25: "Manche Aufzeichnungen wurden nur als ὑπομνήματα zu Papier gebracht, waren aber nur für die ἑταῖροι bestimmt, nicht für eine größere Leserschaft".

[35] Eine moderne Parallele: I. Schudoma hat ab 1978 ihre Mitschriften der Vorlesungen von W. Schadewaldt, die er seit 1950 in Tübingen hielt, veröffentlicht.

[36] Die "Anhänger des Ptolemaios" (Kap. 12,1) zählt Irenäus zu den "jetzt" Lehrenden (als solche werden sie im zweiten Teil behandelt), nicht aber zu der Gruppe der "Schüler" Valentins, von denen er Schriften erhielt; anders C. Markschies, Art. Valentinus, Lex. ant. christl. Lit., 1998, 621: "Offenbar fand eine starke Umprägung der Lehre des V.

dern Anhänger des Valentin waren—und sich auch so nannten—und als solche Schriften besaßen, in deren Besitz Irenäus gelangt war. Den einen oder anderen von ihnen (möglicherweise war es auch nur einer) hat Irenäus sogar noch befragen können. Es folgt zweitens, daß die Lehren, die Irenäus in den ersten Kapiteln vorträgt, nicht auf Ptolemaios und seine Schule zurückgeführt werden dürfen.[37] Der nur in der lateinischen Übersetzung überlieferte Satz: "et Ptolemaeus quidem ita" (8,5) ist ebenfalls als Glosse anzusehen und stellt den ersten Beleg für das Mißverständnis des von Irenäus Gemeinten dar. Er ist zu athetieren und nicht seinerseits in das bei Epiphanios überlieferte griechische Original des Irenäus einzutragen.[38] Es ist nicht unwahrscheinlich, daß ein und derselbe Tradent sowohl im Prooimion als auch hier den Namen des Ptolemaios hinzugesetzt hat, um sowohl die "jetzt Falsches Lehrenden" als auch die "Schüler Valentins" näher zu identifizieren.[39] Wie den späteren Auslegern ist ihm dabei allerdings entgangen, daß es sich dabei in Wahrheit um zwei verschiedene Gruppen handelt. Was Irenäus über Ptolemaios (und seine Anhänger) zu sagen hat, steht allein in Kap. 12,1—und das ist bedauerlich wenig und nicht besonders auffällig.[40] So kann man auch im Blick auf den einzig

---

. . . in der 'Schule des Ptolemaeus' bei röm. Gnostikern statt, die sich selbst 'Schüler des V.' nannten."

[37] Statt vieler Namen, die das System Ptolemaios zuschreiben, sei nur F.-M.-M. Sagnard, *La Gnose valentinienne*, Paris 1947, 227-232 genannt; neuerdings etwas abgewandelt bei W.A. Löhr, Art. Ptolemäus, TRE 27, 1997, 700: "Bei Irenäus, haer. I,1-9 findet sich . . . ein Entwurf der Heilsgeschichte, den Irenäus auf die *Umgebung* des Ptolemaios . . . zurückführt" (kursiv von mir); vgl. Markschies (A. 36), 620: "Iren. haer. I 1,1-8,4 (Ptolemaeus-Schule, nicht Ptolemaeus)", Wanke (A. 17), 211: "Lehrmeinungen der Ptolemäer". Nicht Valentin, auch nicht sein Schüler, sondern die Schüler des Schülers sind für den ketzerischen Mythos verantwortlich! Hier wird die altkirchliche Idee einer "reinen" Frühzeit auf die Spitze getrieben.

[38] Vgl. Wanke (A. 17), 211 A. 51: "Bei dem Schlußsatz von Iren. haer. 1,8,5 . . . dürfte es sich um eine redaktionelle Glosse handeln"; anders z.B. C. Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?*, Tübingen 1992, 365 A. 219: "Diese Worte gehören aber sicher zum originalen Irenäus-Text" und Rousseau (A. 1), 218. Der Versuch, den Satz allein auf die Johannes-Exegese in Kap. 8,5 (so z.B. Löhr [A. 37], 700) scheitert m.E. an dem Plural der Einleitung (διδάσκουσιν); damit kann doch nicht Ptolemaios gemeint sein.

[39] Man muß dann annehmen, daß sich beide Ergänzungen schon in Epiphanius' Vorlage fanden; die Glosse in Kap. 8,5 hat Epiphanios weggelassen (evtl. besaß er eine andere Handschrift ohne dieselbe), weil er Irenäus' ersten Teil im Kap. 31 über Valentin ausschreibt, Ptolemaios aber erst zwei Kapitel später behandelt.

[40] Dieser Text ist von der Forschung aber zumeist übersehen worden (s. dazu A. 45); in seinen beiden Ptolemaios-Artikeln hat ihn z.B. Löhr nicht einmal genannt (TRE 27, 1997, 699-702 und Lex. ant. christl. Lit., 1998, 527f.). Irenäus nennt Ptolemaios an nur drei weiteren Stellen seines Werkes: 2,4,1: "die Äonen des Ptolemaios und Herakleon", 2,25,5: Ptolemaios hat die Apostel nie gesehen, nicht einmal im Traum, 2,28,9: Valentin,

erhaltenen originalen Text, Ptolemaios' "Brief an Flora", urteilen, daß die Bedeutung dieses Valentin-Schülers nicht in der besonderen Gestalt seiner Lehren, sondern m.E. in erster Linie in seinem Martyrium lag (s. A. 20). Erst der gewaltsame Tod macht den "Häretiker" berühmt (wenn auch von der Mehrheitskirche aus begreiflichen Gründen übergangen), so daß ein Glossator die "Falschlehrer" und "Schüler Valentins" mit ihm und seiner Schule gleichsetzt. Damit erhält Ptolemaios allerdings eine Bedeutung, die ihm in der Entwicklung des Valentianismus aller Wahscheinlichkeit nach nicht zukam.

Aus der vorgetragenen Analyse des Vorworts des ersten Buches von Irenäus Werk "Gegen die Häresien" folgt, daß die in der Forschung übliche Zuweisung des valentinianischen Systems in den Kap. 1-9 an Ptolemaios (oder seine Schule) aufgegeben werden muß. Wenn Irenäus sein Referat mit dem unbestimmten "sie sagen", "sie benennen" etc. einführt, ist als Subjekt zu ergänzen: οἱ μαθηταὶ Οὐαλεντίνου, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν.[41] Wessen Lehren haben die "Schüler Valentins" nun tradiert? Die einfache und naheliegende Antwort: die Lehren Valentins natürlich, muß im Hinblick auf das erhaltene Referat modifiziert werden. Denn die in Kap. 11,1 für Valentin überlieferte Äonenlehre entspricht zwar im wesentlichen der im ersten Kapitel referierten,[42] aber in der Frage der Herkunft Christi habe, wie Irenäus betont, Valentin anderes gelehrt als das in den ersten Kapiteln dargestellte System:[43] Die Sophia habe nach ihrem Fall Christus hervorgebracht, der aber habe sie verlassen und sei ins Pleroma aufgestiegen. Diese Lehre wird außerdem für Theodot (32,2f., vgl. 23,2) und in der

---

Ptolemaios und Basilides gäben vor, die Tiefen Gottes erforscht zu haben. Alle drei Stellen sind ganz allgemein gehalten und verraten nichts über Ptolemaios und seine Lehre.

[41] Irenäus nennt im gesamten ersten Teil seine Gewährsmänner stets in der 3. Pers. Plural (λέγουσιν, ὀνομάζουσιν, καλοῦσιν, φάσκουσιν, θέλουσιν κτλ.); allein dies verbietet es, das System Ptolemaios (etwa im Gegensatz zu seinen Schülern) zuzuteilen.

[42] Vgl. Markschies (A. 38), 369: "... Irenäus (stellte) hier lediglich eine etwas variierte Zusammenfassung von Haer. I 1,1 an den Anfang des Valentin-Referates". Ebenso ist die Angabe, Valentin habe zwei Horoi gelehrt, gut mit dem System in Kap. 1-9 vereinbar.

[43] Iren. adv. haer. 1,11,1: Christus sei nicht von den Äonen des Pleroma emaniert worden (so Kap. 2,6), sondern von der aus dem Pleroma ausgeschlossenen Mutter (ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἔξω γενομένης). Die Emanation des aufsteigenden Christus entspricht der Lehre von der Verdoppelung der Sophia (oder der Teilung des Logos in Trac. Trip. NHC I,5, 78,1ff.): der geistige Teil geht ins Pleroma, das übrige bleibt außerhalb. Insofern ist die genannte Mutter die äußere Sophia, die Enthymesis oder Achamoth, von der adv. haer. 1,2,5 gesagt wird: ἀφορισθῆναι ταύτην ἐκτὸς τοῦ Πληρώματος τῶν Αἰώνων, zum Titel "Mutter" für die untere Sophia s. Kap. 4,5, 5,1, 5,2 u.ö.

"Expositio Valentiniana" aus NHC XI,1 bezeugt.[44] Die Frage, ob sie tatsächlich von Valentin stammt, soll nicht entschieden werden; hier geht es darum, daß Irenäus zwischen Valentin und den "Hypomnemata" der "Schüler Valentins" in einem bestimmten Detail eine Differenz betont. Damit stellt sich noch einmal die Frage, wessen Lehren es dann sind, die die "Schüler Valentins" überliefert haben. Eine Antwort darauf bleibt uns der Kirchenvater schuldig. Er hat es unterlassen, eine Verbindung zwischen den beiden ersten Teilen seines Buches herzustellen. Er sagt seinem Leser nicht, wie es zu erklären sei, daß die "Schüler Valentins" in ihren "Hypomnemata" anderes tradieren, als Valentin selbst gelehrt habe. Aber auch keine andere der im zweiten Teil referierten Richtungen ist mit dem zuerst dargestellten System (und seinen Varianten) deckungsgleich.[45] Die Lehren der Kapitel 1-9 werden von Irenäus historisch nicht lokalisiert. Sie stellen für ihn gleichsam ein Grundgerüst valentinianischer Lehren dar (in haer. 4 praef. 2 nennt er es "regula"); dem Eindruck aber, dieses System sei so etwas wie ein valentinianischer Konsens, möchte er dadurch entgegentreten, daß er sogar dem Gründer schon eine abweichende Position unterstellt; so kann er seine These von der Unbeständigkeit der Valentinianer untermauern. Irenäus erreicht auf diese Weise sein Ziel, einerseits einen für alle Valentinianer zutreffenden Umriß zu geben, andererseits die Unterschiedlichkeit ihrer Lehren zu beweisen.

Der Interpret kann sich damit nicht zufrieden geben; denn die Texte der "Schüler Valentins" müssen ja einen bestimmten geistigen Urheber gehabt haben. Dabei können die "Schüler Valentins" neben Valentin selbst

---

[44] Ebenso findet sich in Clem. exc. Thdt. 33,3 die Angabe, daß die Sophia nach Christi Aufstieg den Demiurgen hervorgebracht habe (Iren. haer. 1,11,1).

[45] Auch nicht mit der des Ptolemaios und seiner Schule: von ihnen referiert Irenäus (haer. 1,12,1), der oberste Gott habe das erste Äonenpaar (Nus und Wahrheit) durch zwei διαθέσεις hervorgebracht: durch Denken (ἔννοια) und Wollen (θέλησις oder θέλημα), vgl. dazu Corp. Herm. Ascl. 26: "Und er denkt und will nur Gutes. Dies ist Gott . . .". Denken und Wollen sind keine Äonen, sondern (kreative) Geisteszustände des höchsten Gottes; daraus folgt, daß Gott hier ohne einen weiblichen Partner gedacht wird (so z.B. in Tract. Trip. und Ev. Verit.); dies stimmt allenfalls mit System B überein, das Irenäus in Kap. 2,4 erwähnt, nicht aber mit System A, das in der Regel Ptolemaios zugeschrieben wird. Daß die Äonen aus Gottes Denken und Wollen hervorgehen, paßt übrigens nicht zu Tertullians Nachricht, Ptolemaios habe die Äonen nicht als Gedanken, Affekte und Bewegungen Gottes, sondern als eigenständige Wesen ("personales substantiae") außerhalb Gottes verstanden (Val. 4,2); vielleicht ist damit aber auch lediglich gemeint, daß bei Ptolemaios Gott als Monas ohne Paargenossin neben den anderen Äonen-Syzygien steht; anders W.A. Löhr, La doctrine de Dieu dans la lettre à Flora de Prolémée, RHPhR 75, 1995, 178f.

(s.o.) auch andere valentinianische Lehrer gehört haben. Diese Pluralität legt das erhaltene Exzerpt nahe. Denn aus ihm wird deutlich, daß Irenäus im ersten Teil verschiedene (mindestens zwei) Fassungen des Mythos verarbeitet hat (üblicherweise mit A und B bezeichnet): Er erwähnt in Kap. 2,3-4 die Fassung des Mythos, die Hippolyt im sog. gnostischen Sondergut vorfand.[46] Im zweiten Teil werden dann weitere Varianten (vornehmlich zur Äonenlehre und Christologie) genannt. Welche Gestalt hatten also die dem Irenäus vorliegenden Hypomnemata? Was Irenäus' Umgang mit seiner Quelle angeht, so konnte DIBELIUS zeigen, daß dieser die valentinianischen Schriftbelege aus ihrem ursprünglichen Kontext getrennt und, nach NT und AT geordnet, zusammengestellt hat.[47] In analoger Weise bietet sich als Hypothese an, daß in Irenäus' Quelle die unterschiedlichen Varianten valentinianischer Lehren in die Darstellung des Hauptstranges des Mythos (die Fassung A) eingearbeitet waren.[48] Ob dies in einem einzigen Hypomnema geschehen war, oder ob Irenäus, wie der von ihm benutzte Plural nahelegt, diese Varianten in zwei oder sogar mehreren "Erinnerungsschriften" vorfand, ist dabei von untergeordneter Bedeutung. Wahrscheinlich waren die vorhandenen Varianten zu großen Teilen auch ohne die Angabe ihres geistigen Urhebers notiert; dies würde am besten erklären, warum Irenäus so selten konkrete Namen nennt.[49] Nach dieser Hypothese hat Irenäus einen Teil dieser Varianten bereits in den Kapiteln 1-9 verarbeitet (dort stets ohne die Angabe eines bestimmten Lehrers) und aus den übrigen Abweichungen, die er in seinem Material vorfand, seinen zweiten Teil gebildet (unter Hinzunahme weiterer Quellen über Markos);[50] in diesem zweiten Teil hat er die in seiner Quelle erwähnten Varianten z. T. bestimmten Lehrern (Valentin, Sekundos, Ptolemaios' Schule) zugeordnet, die meisten aber auch hier ohne eine Namensangabe referiert.[51] So erklärt

---

[46] Ab Kap. 2,3 benutzt Irenäus eine neue Quelle (B, s. Hipp. ref. 6,29ff.); er leitet sie mit den Worten ein: ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτῶν οὕτως τὸ πάθος τῆς Σοφίας καὶ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν μυθολογοῦσιν. In 2,4 nennt er den entscheidenden Unterschied der beiden Fassungen A und B: nach A besitzt der höchste Gott eine weibliche Paargenossin, in B ist er allein.

[47] Vgl. oben S. 2; O. Dibelius, Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinianer I, ZNW 9, 1908, 230.

[48] Eine gewisse Parallele bietet sich in Hipp. ref. 6,37,8, wo ein Text Valentins von einem unbekannten Valentinianer kommentiert wird.

[49] Vergleichbar sind in dieser Hinsicht Clemens' "Exzerpte aus Theodot": nur fünfmal wird Theodot namentlich genannt (sechsmal: "er sagt"), zehnmal dagegen: "die Valentinianer sagen", und sechszehnmal "sie sagen".

[50] Zumindest die Kapitel 17,1-2 und 18,1-20,3 beweisen, daß Irenäus auch im zweiten Teil Material aus der Quelle des ersten Teils benutzt hat; s. oben S. 2.

[51] Weshalb er Herakleon, den er einmal in adv. haer. 2,4,1 neben Ptolemaios nennt,

sich auch, warum er in Kap. 11,3 Markos' Lehren bespricht, ohne seinen Namen zu erwähnen, und seine Identität erst in Kap. 15,1 aus einer anderen Quelle als den "Hypomnemata der Schüler Valentins" nachreicht. Wie zuverlässig seine Zuordnungen bestimmter Lehren an bestimmte Personen sind, muß unsicher bleiben. Möglicherweise fand er sie in seiner schriftlichen Quelle vor; sie können aber auch auf mündlicher Information beruhen oder gar Irenäus' eigene Erfindung darstellen. So teilt er z.B. die drei ihm vorliegenden Lehren über die Herkunft Jesu' (aus dem Äon Theletos, aus Christus oder aus dem Äonenpaar Anthropos und Ekklesia) kurzerhand alle Valentin selbst zu (Kap. 11,1). Allein die Triplizität der Lehren läßt Zweifel daran entstehen, ob wirklich Valentin ihr Urheber ist.[52] In gleicher Weise hat er die oben besprochene christologische Sonderlehre Valentin zugeschrieben; wie zuverlässig dies angesichts des ihm vorliegenden Materials ist, kann, wie gesagt, schwer beurteilt werden.

Die Analyse führt zu einem Ergebnis, das erstaunliche Ähnlichkeit mit unserem Wissensstand bezüglich der valentinianischen Nag-Hammadi-Schriften hat. Wir wissen (mit unterschiedlicher Sicherheit), daß es sich um valentinianische Lehren handelt, aber wir haben keine zuverlässigen Informationen, von wem sie stammen. Seinen Grund mag dies im Selbstverständnis der Valentinianer finden. Nicht die Persönlichkeit eines individuellen Lehrers, sondern die durch den Offenbarer geschenkte Erkenntnis steht im Vordergrund. So bleiben viele Texte und Lehren bewußt anonym (oder pseudonym), weil sie sich allein als Auslegung der göttlichen Offenbarung verstehen.[53] Der überhöhte Wahrheitsanspruch drängt die historische Bedingtheit in den Hintergrund. Insofern kann die Analyse für den heutigen Forscher nur unbefriedigend bleiben, wenn er gerade die

---

im ersten Buch nicht erwähnt, muß offen bleiben. War er in den "Hypomnemata" nicht genannt? Origenes nennt Herakleon übrigens nicht "mit Reserve" (so C. Markschies, Art. Herakleon, Lex. ant. christl. Lit., 1998, 281) Valentins Schüler; der Text lautet (in Joh. 2,14,100): βιαίως δὲ οἶμαι καὶ χωρὶς μαρτυρίου τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον Ἡρακλέωνα διηγούμενον τὸ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἐξειληφέναι πάντα τὸν κόσμον κτλ. "Ich glaube, daß Herakleon, der Valentins Schüler genannt wird (s. Clem. strom. 4,71,1), hat gewaltsam und ohne Beweis, als er 'alles entstand durch ihn' auslegte, 'alles' als Kosmos verstanden . . ." βιαίως καὶ χωρὶς μαρτυρίου kann sich seiner Stellung nach nicht auf λεγόμενον beziehen.

[52] Vgl. Markschies (A. 38), 373: "(Der dritte Abschnitt) besteht im Grunde nur aus drei alternativen Erklärungen der Entstehung Jesu, die eher bestätigen, daß zwei oder drei Valentinianer etwas Verschiedenes sagen, als Valentins Lehre wiederzugeben."

[53] Auch wird wohl in der Konfrontation mit der Mehrheitskirche die Anonymität oder Pseudonymität als Schutz gewirkt haben.

Geschichtlichkeit der Erkenntnis (Gnosis) untersucht. Auf der anderen Seite kann die Aufhebung der m.E. falschen Zuweisung von Iren. haer. 1-9 an Ptolemaios die Diskussion um die Urheberschaft besonders der Texte aus dem Jung-Codex beleben. Was Irenäus angeht, scheint es mir bedenkenswert zu sein, den Hauptteil der "Nachschriften" der "Schüler Valentins", d.h. die Fassung A des Mythos, Valentin selbst zuzuschreiben, zumindest die groben Linien und die innerliche Struktur. Dies würde auch erklären, warum ein Ausschnitt aus diesem Mythos in den "Exzerpten aus Theodot und den Lehren der östlichen Schule" wiederkehrt. In seiner Quelle für dieses Werk hat Clemens möglicherweise auch ein solches ὑπόμνημα gefunden, das ein Valentin-Schüler (Theodot?) von den Vorträgen seines Lehrers angefertigt hat (Clem. exc. Th. 43,2-65). Die weitgehende Parallelität der Texte würde sich so am zwanglosesten durch den gemeinsamen Ursprung erklären. Was das Schulhaupt dieser wichtigen Bewegung des 2./3. Jhs. angeht, sollte man nicht der Tradition eines Glossators folgen und die Überlieferung gänzlich dem Lehrer absprechen und dem—wohl aus anderen Gründen berühmten—Schüler oder gar erst dessen Schülern zuteilen.

Center for Hellenic Studies
3100 Whitehaven Street NW
Washington DC 20008
holzhaus@zedat.fu-berlin.de

THE RULE OF TRUTH AND IRENAEAN RHETORIC IN BOOK 1 OF *AGAINST HERESIES*

BY

THOMAS C.K. FERGUSON

Introduction: Reappraising Irenaeus

James Joyce once mentioned that it should take his readers as long to read *Finnegan's Wake* as it took him to write it. Much the same can be said of Irenaeus of Lyon's *Against Heresies*: given the scope and length of the work, combined with its author's manner of writing, it does not easily present itself for interpretation. *Against Heresies* is a text which requires close reading as well as strict attention to the larger structure of the work and intentions of its author in order to gain a deeper insight into Irenaeus's purposes and accomplishments. This article proposes to do exactly that: to reassess the place of Book 1 within the overall structure of *Against Heresies*, showing that rather than providing exposition, it functions as the beginning of Irenaeus's refutation of Gnosticism. Such an assessment of Book 1 will show that the Rule of Truth appearing in 1.10, the centerpiece of Irenaeus's entire argument against the Gnostics, is best understood in light of the construction of the systems of Gnostic thought outlined in 1.1-1.9.

It is this precision with which Irenaeus's work must be read which has been the cause of misinterpretation of the bishop's ability as a writer. In the flowering of Patristic studies at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, Irenaeus was faulted for not fitting into the mold of theologian as both Protestant and Catholic scholars imagined.[1]

[1] Reflecting his own understanding of how a theologian should operate, Johannes Quasten wrote of *Against Heresies*: "The whole work suffers from a lack of clear arrangement and unity of thought. Prolixity and frequent repetition make its perusal wearisome ... Evidently he [Irenaeus] did not have the ability to shape his materials into a homogeneous whole. The defects of form which offend the reader are a result of this lack of synthesis (Quasten, *Patrology, Volume I: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*, 289; Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1950)." From the Protestant side, Adolf von Harnack also faults Irenaeus for not being a systematician: "As we have seen, Irenaeus ... has no strictly systematized theology (Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma, Volume II*, 312; New York: Dover, 1961)."

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001

This image of Irenaeus was critiqued by R.M. Grant, who, some fifty years ago, called for a reappraisal of Irenaeus's intelligence. In Grant's words, "Too often we are content with a picture of Irenaeus as orthodox but rather stupid."[2] Irenaeus benefited from a great rehabilitation following Grant's article. No longer interpreted as a witness to the development of dogma or through confessional polemics, there has been a greater awareness, in the words of Irenaean scholar Mary Ann Donovan, that "The literary process structuring the unity of *AH* is not linear, nor is it logically deductive."[3] The work of Philippe Bacq, among others, has shown that Irenaeus did indeed have a system, though it was unlike that of modernity, and presented his understanding of Irenaean method to show the unity of Book IV of *Against Heresies*.[4] In addition, the work of William Schoedel has also shed substantial light on Irenaeus's overall method of composition.[5]

As a result of this renewal in Irenaean studies, Book 1 is seen as the necessary presentation of Gnostic cosmology followed by refutation from both logic and Scripture in Books 2-5. Given the unique nature of Book 1 in comparison with the remaining books, it has been the subject of extensive form-critical study to determine which sections were of Irenaean origin, and which were taken over from various heresiological sources.[6] Book 1 has also had an additional place within the history of scholarship; with its detailed descriptions of Gnostic groups and their teachings, for many years Irenaeus was an invaluable and sometimes sole source for understanding Gnosticism. With the discovery of the Nag Hammadi texts, Book 1 moved into the center of a debate concerning Irenaeus's accuracy as a source for Gnosticism and raised further questions concerning his overall

---

[2] R.M. Grant, "Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture, *Harvard Theological Review* 43 (1949), 51.

[3] Mary Ann Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," *Second Century* 4 (1984), 223.

[4] Phillippe Bacq, *De l'ancienne à la nouvelle selon S. Irénée: unité de livre IV de l'Adversus Haereses* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1978).

[5] William R. Schoedel, "Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 13 (1959), 27-28. Building upon Grant's work, Schoedel has demonstrated how rhetorical methods undergird Irenaean construction. Schoedel, using methods of rhetorical disputation outlined by Cicero and prevalent in the ancient world, argued that Book 1 is concerned with "the facts of the case, the *narratio*." Books 2-5, in turn, serve as the *confutatio*, or refutation of the premises initially presented.

[6] As best shown in the article by Pheme Perkins, "Irenaeus and the Gnostics: Rhetoric and Composition in *Adversus Haereses* Book One," *Vigiliae Christianae* 30 (1976), 193-200. Responding to the work of Frederik Wisse, Perkins takes into account oral and rhetorical modes of argumentation, arguing for greater Irenaean composition for Book 1 than previously considered, especially 1.29-30. In particular see Perkins, 199.

goals and purposes. Did Irenaeus represent his foes truthfully, or was he only concerned with proving his point?[7] The general consensus now is that Irenaeus was fairly reliable in his transmission of Gnosticism.

Though neither the role of Irenaeus as an historical source nor his worth as a systematic theologian is my focus, nonetheless the preceding synopsis of images of Irenaeus and of Book 1 is significant in that, despite the varied opinions and biases throughout the history of Irenaean study, these writers reflect a common methodological presupposition: as Mary Ann Donovan notes, scholars will find what they are looking for.[8] Asking whether Irenaeus is a systematic theologian or an accurate historical source is inherently flawed, for he aspired to be neither in composing *Against Heresies*. The debates surrounding Irenaeus's accuracy have failed to take into account the internal rhetorical argument, use of language, and intricate structural composition which have been recognized as hallmarks of his method. Far from setting the stage for the refutation, Book 1 is the beginning of that refutation. Accordingly this paper takes the form of a commentary on the first ten chapters of Book 1, to show the layers of construction of the text, culminating in the Rule of Truth in 1.10.

One can see that Book 1 consists primarily of descriptions of Gnostic cosmology and salvation, punctuated in 1.10 and 1.22 by Irenaeus's Rule of Truth (first mentioned in 1.9.4, developed in 1.10 and 1.22). This Rule of Truth has been considered as a form of baptismal creed, though Irenaeus's precise source for it cannot be reconstructed. It is the Rule of Truth that Irenaeus expounds more fully in Books 3-5, supporting his argument with the Hebrew Scriptures, Gospels, and apostolic writings—or, in Irenaean language, the prophets, words of the Lord, and words of the apostles.

It is my contention that the Rule of Truth is conditioned by Irenaeus's presentation of the Gnostic systems outlined in 1.1-8 and 1.11-21. Rather than functioning as the *narratio*, Book 1 is devoted to the beginning of Irenaeus's refutation of the Gnostic systems, with his critique running insep-

---

[7] Elaine Pagels attacked Irenaeus's reliability, first in her article "Conflicting Versions of Valentinian Eschatology: Irenaeus's *Treatise* vs. *Excerpts from Theodosius*," *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974), 35-53, as well as in *The Gnostic Gospels* (New York: Random House, 1979). For Pagels Irenaeus's motive was to "'subvert and destroy' the theology of those he considers a threat to the church ("Conflicting Versions of Valentinian Eschatology," 53)." Pagels has in turn been critiqued, most notably by R.M. Grant, "Review of *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis* and *The Gnostic Paul*, by Elaine Pagels," *Religious Studies Review* 3 (1977), 30-34.

[8] Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," 223.

arably parallel to his exposition. Irenaeus lays the groundwork in his Preface, and, through the unfolding of his rhetorical discourse, the Rule of Truth is built upon his descriptions of Gnosticism, and as a refutation is part of a appropriation of Gnostic terminology of salvation and creation. Such an application of recent developments in Irenaean thought to Book 1 is long overdue, and a necessary companion to the work done on Books 2-5.[9]

I. Against Heresies, *Preface to Book 1: Beginnings of Appropriation*

An appreciation of the depth of Irenaeus's understanding and appropriation of Gnosticism is found at the very beginning of his work. In his Preface, Irenaeus sets the stage through modes of argumentation and the development of a theological vocabulary which will become increasingly important in his descriptions of Gnosticism.[10] In typical Irenaean fashion, the wording and turns of phrase in his Preface will be echoed later in the work, pointing back towards the beginning. In Irenaeus's opinion, the Gnostics are to be faulted first and foremost for their flawed methods of reading the Scriptures and for presenting this misinterpretation in their teaching. The image Irenaeus uses to illustrate this methodology comes from a quotation from "one greater than we," of mistaking an authentic, precious stone for a fake constructed from glass. The Gnostics, for Irenaeus, "speak the same language as we do, but intend different meanings."[11] Echoing the language of the Pastoral Epistles, these culprits are like "certain persons (τινες)" who engage in theological speculation.[12] Having estab-

---

[9] Such a study is something Donovan recognized as necessary fifteen years ago: "For example, how would such a study of *AH* I affect the reading of the Gnostic exegesis at 1.9 leading into the section on the Christian faith at 1.10, and the critique of Gnostic systems of redemption at 1.21 leading into the section on the *Regula veritatis* at 1.22?"; Donovan, 223.

[10] Often wrongly identified as "Valentinian" Gnosticism, as identified by Dominic J. Unger's chapter headings in his translation *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 23, 27. This is in spite of the fact that Irenaeus himself specifically notes in 1.8.5 that he is describing Ptolemaean Gnosticism, and that his Valentinian section commences in 1.11.1. The *Sources Chretiennes* edition does not have this confusion; see Adelin Rousseau, *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies* (Paris: Cerf, 1979), 29.

[11] Expressed more pithily in the Greek than Unger's translation: "ὅμοια μὲν (ἡμῖν) λαλοῦντας, ἀνόμοια δὲ φρονοῦντας (*similia quidem nobis loquentes, dissimilia vero sentientes*)," I.Preface.2, SC 264: 22.

[12] 1 Timothy 1.4, quoted in Preface 1, SC 264: 19. The "τινες ἐπεισάγουσι λόγους ψευδεῖς" of Irenaeus are linked with τινες charged with speculation in the Pastorals.

lished a methodological approach, as well as presented illustrative images and Scriptural allusions, Irenaeus addresses his intended audience directly: "You yourself . . . will develop these points, receiving from us, as it were, only the seeds and beginnings. In the broad range of your mind you will reap abundant fruit from our brief statements . . ."[13]

These closing statements contain some of the central elements to the Gnostic systems which Irenaeus is about to present: the language of "seeds" (σπέρματα, *semen*) and of their "bearing abundant fruit."[14] Unger, following upon Rousseau's commentary in the SC text, describes Irenaeus's use of these words as "belonging to the quasi-technical vocabulary of the Gnostics. Irenaeus gathers them together at this place for a clearly ironic purpose."[15] Rousseau and Unger are wrong on both counts. At the core of their underappreciation of Irenaeus, they are following in the tradition that holds Book 1 as primarily an exposition, thus failing to take into account Irenaeus's rhetorical construction. Firstly, despite ambiguity as to what these words may have meant in the overall phenomenon of Gnosticism (which may account for Unger's term "quasi-technical"[16]), in Irenaeus's description of the Gnostics, these terms have very technical meanings. Secondly, to dismiss words so central to his description of Gnosticism as "irony" is a disservice. Rather they are the beginnings of the appropriation of Gnostic discourse which continues throughout 1.1-1.8, reaching a peak in 1.9-1.10

II. *1.1-1.8: Preview of the* Confutatio

Following his introduction Irenaeus begins to describe the Gnostic understanding of the formation of the universe as well as the creation of matter and humanity. Throughout the course of 1.1-1.8, Irenaeus groups his material in large thematic blocks, as others have noted.[17] But to supplement

---

[13] Preface.3; Unger, 22.

[14] πολὺ καρποφορήσεις; *multum fructificabis*; SC 264: 26.

[15] Unger, footnote 23, 130, basically quoting Rousseau: "Irénée les accumule à cet endroit dans une intention manifestement ironique (SC 263: 171)."

[16] Unger's term "quasi-technical" most likely stems from one of two premises: as either part of a polemical unwillingness to concede that Gnosticism had a system at all, or in an attempt to acknowledge the multiformity of Gnosticism, and not willing to acknowledge that one can determine or name anything as truly Gnostic. Either way the use of the term does not do justice to Irenaeus's presentation in Book 1.

[17] For a concise outline of 1.1-9, see Mary Ann Donovan, *One Right Reading? A Guide to Irenaeus* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 29-42.

Donovan and the scholarly understanding of 1.1-1.8, it is important to note that there is a consistent thread of critique which runs throughout the section. Furthermore, this critique is not haphazard; these sections are linked with one another and, more importantly, along with the description of the Gnostics, point ahead to 1.9-1.10, the presentation of the Rule of Truth. I accordingly offer the following outline, organized around Irenaeus's unfolding argument:[18]

1.1-2 Gnostic cosmology; the emission of the Aeons

1.3 *Examples of Gnostic exegesis* in support of cosmology

2.1-6 The fall of Sophia, creation of a form of matter, and restoration through Limit/Intention; stabilization of Pleroma

3.1-5 *Examples of Gnostic exegesis* in support of cosmology, fall of Sophia, and creation of Savior

3.6 *First Irenaean interlude*; critique of exegesis

4.1-4.2 Fall of Achamoth and creation of material world

4.3-4 *Second Irenaean interlude*; critique of method

4.5-6.1 Formation of Demiurge/Man and threefold nature of humanity

6.2-4 *Third Irenaean interlude*: accuses Gnostics of insulting members of the church in 6.3, of immoral behavior in 6.4.

7:1-5 Description of threefold nature of humankind.

8.1 Critique of Gnostic exegesis

8.2-5 Examples of Gnostic exegesis.

---

[18] Rather than thematically, for example, as in Donovan's outline.

It is the three Irenaean interludes which will serve as the focus of the following commentary, for it is in these places where Irenaeus inserts his own voice that we can see how he is preparing the reader for the Rule of Truth.

First Interlude: 1.3.6 and the Rule of Truth

This outline highlights the juxtaposition of Irenaeus's description of Gnosticism and their[19] Scriptural exegesis. The outline also provides a sense of the repetition in this portrayal: 1.4.1-4.2, with the description of the fall of Achamoth, recalls the fall of Sophia in 1.2.1-6. The threefold description of creation of humankind is picked up again in 1.7.1-5, with reference to the perfection of the pneumatics and fate of the hylics and psychics. What is especially important in presenting the material in the above fashion is noting the three separate places where Irenaeus breaks into the narrative and offers commentary apart from exegetical critique, what I have called the Irenaean "interludes." It is precisely these three interludes which are crucial in establishing the basis for Irenaeus's critique which follows in Books 2-5.

1.3.6, as the first of these interludes, follows on the heels of Irenaeus's second presentation of Gnostic Scriptural exegesis and recalls the preface to the work. The τοιαῦτα of 1.3.6 and the conclusion of 1.3.4 are the first two uses of the word since Preface.3; these conclusions of Gnostic exegesis are linked with those things promised as the stated goals of the work as a whole. As in the preface, the charge that the Gnostics are at heart falsifying the words of the Scriptures is also repeated. Whereas in the Preface the Gnostics are accused of falsifying the word of the Lord, "῾ραδιουργοῦντες τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου,"[20] in 1.3.6 the same participial construction is used, though the object is different: "῾ραδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις."[21] Given the

---

[19] Here I am self-consciously using the word "they" to describe the Gnostics, as this is Irenaeus's preferred method himself throughout 1.1-1.8. He constantly uses third-person plural verb forms, attempting to present a unified portrait of Gnosticism. As mentioned before, it is only at the end of this description, in 1.8.5, that he reveals he is describing Ptolemaean Gnosticism.

[20] Preface.1; Latin "*falsantes verba Domini*"; SC 264: 18.

[21] 1.3.6, SC 264: 61. Taking Bruno Reynders' *Lexique Comparé du texte grec et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de L'Adversus Haereses de Saint Irénée*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum orientalium 141, Subsidia 5-6 (Louvain:1954) as a start, and supplementing it with my own textual study (since, invaluable as Reynders is, he does not

similarity in construction and the fact that these are the only two occurrences of this verb, here is a prime example of the Preface to *Against Heresies* providing the building blocks for the construction of Irenaean rhetoric.

The echoes to the opening paragraphs continue. After picking up on the charge of Gnostic falsification, Irenaeus returns to a discussion of the truth. As a result of their teaching the Gnostics are accused of leading the faithful away as captives from the truth: "*in captiuitatem ducunt a veritate/* αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας."[22] The word "truth," (*veritas*/ἀληθεία) has served two distinct functions for Irenaeus. Throughout the Preface Irenaeus showed a concern for the truth. The opening line of the work describes the Gnostics as those "rejecting the truth."[23] Through their deceitful presentations, the Gnostic truth appears truer than "truth itself."[24] Further, he promises to show how "incongruous with the truth their statements are."[25] In the Preface, *veritas*/ἀλήθεια represented the ontological truth of the Christian tradition, which the Gnostics rejected and attempted to substitute with their own. Here, for once, Unger's (and others') capitalization is appropriate:[26] in the Preface Irenaeus is putting forward the understanding that there is the Truth.

Truth functions in a second way for Irenaeus—namely, as the name of one of the Aeons of the Gnostic cosmology, as in 1.1.1, where the Aeon Truth is part of the Pythagorean Tetrad, emitted with Mind. This use of Truth reappears in 1.3.3, just prior to 1.3.6, again in reference to the first Tetrad. Truth thus serves as an apt example of Irenaean methodology in Book 1. Having put forward "the" Truth as a foundational element of his understanding of Christianity—that there is such a thing, and "they" reject it—*veritas*/ἀλήθεια is then presented within its technical function in the Gnostic system (not quasi-technical), and in 1.3.6 the word is reappropri-

---

cross-reference everything), these are the only two times that Irenaeus uses this verb. The parallel was not carried over into the Latin translation; whereas in Preface.1 the verb is "*falsantes*," in 1.3.6 it is rendered "*adulterantes expositiones.*"

[22] SC 264: 62.

[23] "*Quatenus veritatem refutantes*," Greek "Ἐπεὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν παραπεμπόμενοί τινες," SC 264: 18.

[24] "*ipsa veritate*/αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας," SC 264: 21.

[25] "*non stantia neque apta veritati*/ἀνάρμοστα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ," SC 264: 24.

[26] Where it is less clear, for instance, is in regards to the word spirit; capitalization in English makes the word into the Holy Spirit, where sometimes it is not clear that is what Irenaeus intends.

ated and used to further Irenaeus's critique. Irenaeus describes those being led into captivity as ones "who do not guard a firm faith in the one Father Almighty and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God." As Unger notes, again following Rousseau's commentary, "We have here the two main beliefs of the Creed."[27] What is lacking is an appreciation for the beginning steps in Irenaeus's argument. In a sense Unger and Rousseau perpetuate the interpretation of Irenaeus which Grant described: by looking solely at the Rule of Truth, to the detriment of analyzing the development of his rhetoric, they fail to appreciate the layers of composition of Book 1.

While correct to point out that 1.3.6 serves as a prelude to the Rule of Truth as presented in 1.10.1, Rousseau and Unger fail to note the crucial Irenaean appropriation of language which, as shown above, is emblematic of his portrayal of the Gnostics. While it is true that this is the first time that "one Father Almighty and one Jesus Christ, the Son of God" appear in the text, it is not the first time that "Father," "Jesus," "Christ," and "Son" have appeared. Irenaeus employs all of these words in 1.1.1-1.3.5. Without going into the details of all of the references, suffice to say that these words each describe an essential element in the Gnostic systems of cosmology and of salvation. In Irenaeus's description, "Father" is name given to the emitter of the Aeons, as in 1.1.1-2, whom the original Duodecad glorify through emitting further Aeons in conjugal partnerships, forming the thirty Aeons of the Pleroma. "Christ" is essential to the Gnostic system as described in 1.2.5. Emitted as a dyad with Holy Spirit, Christ allowed for the stabilization of the Pleroma and subsequent peace which permitted the Aeons to create Savior (a second Christ), as described in 1.2.6. "Son" appears twice in 1.3.3, referring to the Gospel account of the woman with the flow of blood in Irenaeus's description of Gnostic exegesis. Irenaeus, while previewing the Rule of Truth in 1.3.6, also collects terms described by their technical meaning for the Gnostics and presents them as the core of what will be picked up again as the Rule of Truth. Irenaeus has already told us the Gnostics have the same language, just that they mean different things when they speak; the Truth described in the Preface is being linked with the confessed faith of the church as Irenaeus describes it. By taking back the Gnostics' language, 1.3.6 thus forms an essential link in Irenaeus's argument.

---

[27] Unger, footnote 37, 151. See Rousseau, SC 263: 189.

Second Interlude: 1.4.3-4: Variety in Method

Irenaeus returns to his description of the Gnostics in 1.4.1-2, concerned with recounting the fall of Achamoth. The description of the fall and restoration of Achamoth has much in common with that of Sophia as told in 1.2. There is the same longing, a fall into experiencing emotion and passion, and a similar emission of some sort of substance on account of this. It is this emotion, as Irenaeus recounts, that the Gnostics believe was the cause the formation of matter, as described in 1.4.2. This understanding of the origin of matter leads into the second Irenaean interlude in 1.4.3-4, where he displays a different element of his refutation.

In 1.3.6 he began to prepare the reader for the Rule of Truth in 1.10.1. In 1.4.3-4 he previews both a theme and a mode of argumentation which will achieve greater prominence throughout Book 1, stretching into the later books. 1.4.3 marks the first time that Irenaeus notes the diversity of Gnostic teaching: "We have here, then, a great tragedy and a fantasy, as each one of them pompously explains, one this way, another that way." The theme of Gnostic diversity as opposed to the uniformity of Irenaeus's faith will become an increasingly important part of his argument of *Against Heresies*, and it is first sounded here. But one must not immediately interpret the passage solely in such a manner. It is not the multiplicity itself which Irenaeus notes; rather the diversity of teaching and the mystery of the teachings are linked to the economic motive of the Gnostics: teaching for money. Whereas "our Lord" admonished us to "give without pay," the Gnostic teachers teach for pay, and furthermore teach absurd fantasies.

Irenaeus inserts himself into the narrative in 1.4.4: "I myself wish to contribute something to their prolific retinue." "Prolific retinue" is Unger's translation of "*fructificationi eorum*/καρποφορίᾳ αὐτῶν."[28] These words in turn point back to the Preface, where Irenaeus promised his friend he would "reap abundant fruit"[29] from his statements. What follows is a mode of argumentation different from what has appeared up to this point in the work. Having argued for an essential truth in Christianity, Irenaeus now turns to the domain of rhetoric and attempts to confute the Gnostics using their own logic. This rhetorical device is called an *enthymema*, whose goal is "to convince the opponent on grounds that he himself was forced to

[28] SC 264: 70.

[29] "*in multum fructificabis*/πολὺ καρποφορήσεις," SC 264: 26.

accept as true."[30] William Schoedel describes such reasoning by Irenaeus in Book 2 of the *Against Heresies*; here we have use of the same form of argumentation in Book 1. Having described the Gnostic understanding of the formation of matter, Irenaeus then proceeds on the basis of that description to show its untenable nature. Waters of all kind had its formation from Achamoth's tears (1.4.2).[31] Irenaeus's response takes this literal understanding on its own terms and exploits the logical inconsistencies inherent within it: How could all kind of waters be formed from her tears, since some water is fresh and some is salty? Irenaeus carries this argument to its absurd extremes, leaving unsaid the origin of "hot and pungent" waters.

Such an argument from logic comes to the fore in Book 2. For example in 2.12 Irenaeus, building upon his description of the pairs of Aeons, brings out the contradictions within the system itself. Commenting upon the names given to the Aeons, Irenaeus wonders how can Silence exist concurrently with Word (2.12.5); the two would seem mutually exclusive by their very definition. As Donovan notes, Irenaeus exploits "the literal application of the analogy of human thought to the emission of the Aeons."[32] Irenaeus does so, however, in a manner first introduced in 1.4.4 and echoing his words from the Preface. The rhetorical construction is the same as in 1.3.6, building upon coded language, to provide the same goal, a preview of future confutation. It is the method of refutation previewed which differs, witnessing to the dense layers of Irenaean textual construction.

Third Interlude: 1.6.2-4: Right Conduct and the Church

Following this second interlude, Irenaeus picks up his description where he left off, concerning himself with creation. He describes the Gnostic understanding of the role of the Demiurge, of creation in 5.1-6, and different classes of persons in 6.1. This leads into Irenaeus's third break from his description of the Gnostics in 6.2-4. As we have seen Irenaeus has followed his description of the Gnostics with different modes of refutation. 6.2-4 functions in the same manner. His description of the three classes of persons allows him to contrast the moral behavior of his own church and of the Gnostics. Noting that the Gnostics believe that the "ensouled

---

[30] As described by William R. Schoedel, "Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus*," 28.

[31] "*a lacrimis enim eius factam universam umidam substantiam*/ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν δακρύων αὐτῆς γεγονέναι πᾶσαν ἔνυγρον οὐσίαν," SC 264: 66-67.

[32] Donovan, *One Right Reading*, 51.

(*psychici*/ψυχικοί) persons are disciplined by ensouled measures . . . they claim that we of the church are these persons (1.6.2)." This accusation, put in the mouths of the Gnostics, represents the first time that Irenaeus has used the word church in a self-referential manner. The word has appeared twice previously. The first occurrence, in 1.2.6, described the rejoicing of the Aeons, wherein the conjugal pairs adopted the characteristics of each other: "the female Aeons all became Truths and Lives and Spirits and Churches." The second use of the word comes in 1.5.6, where church is described as the spiritual man, the result of the seed planted by Achamoth in Demiurge, and an "antitype of the church on high."

Irenaeus is able to accomplish two tasks in 6.2-4. First, he is able to reappropriate the last piece of the Rule of Truth that will follow in 1.10. Having already redefined "Father," and "Christ" from the Gnostic understanding, Irenaeus takes the word church and applies it to his own group of Christians. Up to this point the Gnostics and their teachers have been portrayed as very much "in the family,"[33] functioning within the Christian community. Furthermore Irenaeus has shown both the role of the Aeon "Church" within their system as well as their understanding of the offspring of Achamoth as representing a type of Church located within the Pleroma. In his accusations against the Gnostics in 1.6.2, Irenaeus first defines his group of Christians within Lugdunum as "the church."[34] Second, 1.6.3-4 allows Irenaeus to present the first of many future *ad hominem* arguments in the *Against Heresies*. In this one, Irenaeus attacks the Gnostics on moral grounds, accusing them of licentiousness (which would become the standard charge against deviant groups),[35] derived from his interpretation of their understanding of the spiritual versus ensouled Christians.

Thus the three Irenaean interludes from 1.1-1.8 follow similiar patterns of argumentation, namely, an appropriation of Gnostic terms and concepts, combined with a of preview three different Irenaean forms of confutation: the Rule of Truth, the enthymema, and the *ad hominem*.

---

[33] Arguing for evidence of diversity within the church of Lyons, Donovan writes: "Furthermore the mythological material gives indications that the Valentinians exist within the Christian community . . . Their presence, as it were, 'in the family,' would be of immense concern to a man like Irenaeus," Donovan, *One Right Reading*, 32.

[34] SC 264: 92-93: "*qui sumus ab Ecclesia*/εἶναι δὲ τούτους ⟨τοὺς⟩ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἡμᾶς." Once again Unger, following Rousseau, chooses to capitalize "Church" and, in this instance, capturing rightly Irenaeus's intent to limit this definition to his group.

[35] For a tracing of this motif throughout both Christian and Jewish constructions of heresiology, see Shaye J.D. Cohen, "A Virgin Defiled" Some Rabbinic and Christian Views on the Origins of Heresy, *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 36 (1980), 1-11.

III. *1.8.1-1.9.5: Preparation for the Rule of Truth*

Having shown the diversity of his argumentation and preparation for the Rule of Truth, 1.8.1 marks a break from Irenaeus's pattern of construction and provides him with an opportunity to summarize his work up to this point. Commencing with one of his marking words, τοιαύτης, Irenaeus presents the system[36] outlined as one "which neither the prophets preached, nor the Lord taught, nor the apostles handed down," expressing typically Irenaean understanding of the threefold division of the Scriptures. 1.8.1 serves as a more expanded critique of Gnostic exegesis than that offered in 1.3.6 by returning to the pattern outlined in the Preface. The key phrase concerns the "words of the Lord." In Preface.1, Irenaeus accused the Gnostics of falsifying the words of the Lord to lead away the ignorant. In 1.8.1, the Gnostics "deceive many by the badly composed fantasy of the Lord's words they adapt." As in the preface, Irenaeus offers an illustration of Gnostic exegesis, arguing that it is analogous to rearranging the stones of a mosaic, transforming the image of a king into that of a dog or a fox. This in turn calls to mind the illustration given in Preface.2; the "precious stone" which the glass imitation mocks is paralleled by the "precious gems" which make up the mosaic.[37] The skillful artisan of the mosaic is likewise paralleled in Preface.2, where the presence of one "skillful" is enough to expose the false glass gem, as well as the copper joined to silver.[38] Furthermore, whereas in Preface.1 Irenaeus quotes 1 Timothy 1.4 at the beginning, he returns to the same letter, quoting 1 Timothy 4.7 at the conclusion of 1.8.1. Through language, illustration, and Scriptural quotation, 1.8.1 mirrors the Preface.

Accordingly 1.8.2-5 summarize Gnostic exegesis, organized around the thematic exposition of 1.1.1-1.7.5. 1.8.2-4 provides examples of Gnostic exegesis in support of their doctrines of the three groups of persons, the descent of Achamoth, and the passions of Sophia. 1.8.5 concludes this chapter with a lengthy description of Gnostic exegesis of the Prologue to

---

[36] The technical term applied here is *argumentum*/ὑπόθεσις (SC 264: 112) which echoes the description given in 1.4.4.

[37] "ex gemmis pretiosis," 1.8.1, SC 264: 114; compare "*lapidem pretiosum*" of Preface. 2, SC 264: 20.

[38] Compare the "*a sapiente artifice*/ὑπὸ σοφοῦ τεχνίτου" who creates the image in 1.8.1 (SC 264: 114) and the one who tests and exposes in Preface.2, "*probare et artificium arguere*/δοκιμάσαι καὶ τέχνην διελέγξαι," SC 264: 20-21.

the Gospel of John in support of the primary Ogdoad. Of these descriptions, 1.8.5 is particular important for investigating 1.9.

1.9.1-5 serves as a bridge from Irenaeus's description of Gnosticism and the introduction of the major themes of 1.10-1.22, and in doing so employs a chiastic form of argumentation for the first time. Beginning with a short summary preface, Irenaeus begins to present the conclusions of the opening chapters of the work. He addresses his intended reader, "my dear friend," for the first time since the Preface.[39] Having promised an exposition and description to his friend, in 1.9.1 he announces that he has done so, describing the preceding chapters as presenting the "method" (employing a technical term, *adinventio*/μέθοδος) of the Gnostics. There are the same repeated charges of "fabricating" the Scriptures, but with a slight twist. Rather than deceiving the faithful, the Gnostics actually "deceive themselves."

Irenaeus then seeks to prove how those whom he has previously described as deceiving others deceive themselves, and the chiastic form of argumentation follows, with its centerpiece an exegesis of the Prologue to John, appropriating the text from the Gnostics.

Outline of the Chiasm:

1.9.1[40]: The enthymema: argument confuting premises established by Gnostic exegesis.

1.9.2: Exegesis of John's Prologue, counterpoint to Gnostic exegesis of 1.8.5.

1.9.3: Dogmatic implications based on premises established through proper exegesis.

Marking separation between his summary and the chiasm with the disjunctive "*primo*/πρῶτον," Irenaeus constructs his logical argument in two parts. With devastating simplicity, Irenaeus asks: if John had intended to portray the Gnostic doctrine of the divine Ogdoad, then why are they not mentioned in the gospel? In the second place, if understanding that the Aeons were emitted in pairs is so essential, then why, if John mentions "man" in his Prologue, does he not mention Man's conjugal partner, "church?" His painstaking enumeration of the Aeons and inclusion of Gnostic exegesis in 1.8.5 is in order to provide the logical ground for its refutation.

---

[39] "*dilectissime*/ἀγαπητέ," first appearing in Preface.2, SC 264, 22, and appearing again SC 264: 136-37.

[40] Beginning in line 6 of the SC text; SC 264: 136.

The middle and third sections of the chiasm are marked off by emphatic *igitur*/οὖν constructions; in 1.9.2, "*manifesta igitur*/φανερὰ οὖν." In 1.9.2 Irenaeus seeks to explain the plain words of the text, referring to the "one God almighty and one only begotten Jesus Christ," echoing his statements in 1.3.6. In the construction of their alternative language, the Gnostics take the words to mean something which they do not. They "misuse the names and transfer them to their own system." In Irenaeus's first extensive biblical exegesis (previous exegesis up to this point has consisted of Gnostic examples), the Prologue of John's gospel is reclaimed for "the truth."

In the third section of the chiasm, beginning in 1.9.3, Irenaeus provides an exhortation, building upon his refutation and his exegesis to begin the construction of dogmatic principles which will lead into the Rule of Truth. The *igitur*/οὖν is here combined with the imperative *discite*/μάθετε, and the "foolish people," presumably the Gnostics but perhaps also those who have been led astray, are admonished that "Jesus who suffered for us, who dwelt among us, this very same one is the Word of God." The terms "Jesus" and "Logos" have, up to this point, been part of the Gnostic system. Irenaeus combines these terms to show how Scripture should be rightly interpreted. This exhortation is linked to the first section of the chiasm in 1.9.1 through similiar logical argumentation, namely, that if it was to be through an Aeon, or an Ogdoad, that we would be saved, then John would have written that in the Gospel. As in 1.9.1, in 1.9.3 Irenaeus tells us that the Gnostic interpretation is simply not supported by the words of Scripture.

1.9.4 provides an alternative illustration of this Gnostic process of rearrangement of Scripture, complementing those of Preface.2 and 1.8.1. Departing from his physical, artistic imagery, Irenaeus brushes off his rhetorical skills uses a metaphor taken from Homer. The purpose of the example, however, is the same: just as a skillful person can expose the glass fake for the gem, so can someone who knows Homer well put the verses back into their proper arrangement. The reason for moving from a physical image to an example from the written word is that Irenaeus's immediate purpose is literary rather than purely illustrative: the example from Homer leads directly into the first mention of the Rule of Truth in the middle of 1.9.4:

> In the same way, anyone who keeps unchangeable in himself the rule of truth received through baptism will recognize the names and sayings and parables from the Scriptures, but this blasphemous scheme of theirs he will not recognize.

In his introduction of the Rule of Truth, Irenaeus is building upon the linguistic and methodological work of the preceding chapters of *Against*

Heresies. The word truth has moved from being an element of the Gnostic system, while referring to the ontological truth of the Christian Church, to the truth received by the faithful at baptism. Likewise the "scheme" of the Gnostics, the *argumentum*/ὑπόθεσις of 1.8-1.9, can be vanquished through proper methodology, illustrated through his Homeric image, and buttressed by his return to the metaphor of the king and the mosaic. Forming an *inclusio* with 1.8.1, the one who keeps the faith will not be deceived by the Gnostics, but will recognize the king for the king, not the fox. Language and methodology come together in 1.8.1-1.9.4.

IV. *The Rule of Truth: The Culmination of the* Narratio

Irenaeus moves into his formulation of the Rule of Truth in 1.9.5. Separating this section from 1.9.1-4, Irenaeus employs theatrical terminology: "Since an ending is lacking to this drama,"[41] Irenaeus promises to provide an appropriate one. Both the vocabulary and logic of his argument recall 1.4.3. Whereas in 1.4.3 he described the Gnostic understanding of the formation of matter as a τραγῳδία, he again uses a dramatic metaphor, describing the *scena*/σκηνή of the Gnostics, also referred to as "their farce" (μῖμος αὐτῶν). As part of Irenaeus's promised finale, he also reprises the theme of Gnostic diversity first also introduced in 1.4.3 as well. Yet whereas in 1.4.3 this theme was linked to the absurdity of people actually paying for Gnostic teaching, in 1.9.5 Irenaeus juxtaposes the notion of Gnostic diversity with the unity of the faith of the church, something which he will elaborate in depth throughout the remainder of *Against Heresies*.

The Rule of Truth proper commences in 1.10.1-2. In an analysis of its opening lines, in light of the discussion of Irenaeus's use of language in the preceding chapters, one cannot help but note that, whatever its origin, Irenaeus's presentation of the Rule follows directly from his creation and appropriation of the Gnostics' theological vocabulary. He begins with "the church," ἡ ἐκκλησία, its first appearance since 1.6.2, continuing the delineation between the true Church and various Gnostic understandings of the word. The church is "dispersed" throughout the world. The verb

---

[41] "*Quoniam autem scenae huic deest redemptio*/ἐπειδὴ (δὲ) τῇ σκηνῇ ταύτῃ λείπει ἡ ἀπόλυσις," SC 264: 150-51. Following both Rousseau and Unger, the conjecture of ἀπόλυσις, in its theatrical understanding of a dismissal, rather than theologically loaded ἀπολύτρωσις (deliverance, redemption) of Epiphanius's text, ties in with both the sense of the passage and the previous allusion to theatrical imagery in 1.4.3. For Rousseau's discussion, see SC 263: 222-23; Unger, footnote 25, 183.

employed is seminata/διεσπαρμένη. This concept has a technical meaning within the Gnostic system of salvation, as employed by Irenaeus in 1.5.6 in reference to seed planted within Demiurge by Achamoth. Yet it also recalls the Preface to the work, in which Irenaeus hoped that his reader would reap the seeds of his work; here the terminology is reappropriated and applied to the church which is spread like seed throughout the world.

Irenaeus also alludes to the Preface in his presentation of the next significant theme, the apostolic transmission of doctrine, which next appears in the Rule of Truth. The church "received from the apostles and their disciples the faith . . ." The last mention of the disciples, apart from his sections listing examples of Gnostic exegesis, has to do with the Valentinian disciples with whom Irenaeus conversed in Preface.2. *Discipulus*/μαθητής appears first in Preface.3 in reference to the Valentinians. It appears three times more, in 1.3.2, 3.3, and 3.5 (where it is included in a quotation from Luke 14.27). In 1.3.2 it refers to the eighteen months which Jesus spent with his disciples as proving the eighteen Aeons outside of the Duodecad. More interestingly, in 1.3.3 it describes Jesus as teaching his disciples the truth of the Aeons through his healing. In this sense, the use in 10.1 could recall both the disciples of Valentinians, contrasting their teachings with those of the Lord's apostles, as well as claiming the true teaching of the disciples, as opposed to the Gnostic claim to apostolic teaching in 3.3.

Turning to the credal formulation of the Rule,[42] Irenaeus presents a Trinitarian formulation, beginning with professing "the faith in one God the Father Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth and the seas and all things that are in them." Throughout his presentation of the Trinity, Irenaeus is following the linguistic methodology of first hinting, then elaborating the meaning of the word in his Gnostic system, then finally reappropriating the same word. The phrase "God the Father Almighty"[43] demonstrates this, having been previewed in 1.3.6. Irenaeus is also accomplishing another important goal in 1.10.1-2: he is furthering his own exegesis, begun in earnest in the chiasm in 1.9.1-4. Thus while returning to

---

[42] While arguing that Irenaeus is drawing on some formulation of the faith already available, Unger draws attention to the fact that many of the statements do appear to be typically Irenaean. What he does not discuss in his notes is how the words which make up these doctrinal statements are employed and crafted by Irenaeus in 1.1.1-1.9.4. See Unger's discussion, footnote 1, 183-84; he once again follows Rousseau, SC 263: 223-24.

[43] "*in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem*/εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα," SC 264: 155; compare 1.3.6, where the same phrase is used: "*in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem*/εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα," SC 264: 62.

some of the important phrases in his Trinitarian exposition, Irenaeus also describes the Trinity with a host of Scriptural allusions.

This method of exegesis, which Unger and Rousseau have noted, is used in conjunction with his construction of theological vocabulary, as the next line shows. The one God is "creator of heaven and earth and the seas and all things that are in them." This description of God's creating power is part of the steady accumulation of Scriptural quotations in 1.10.1, alluding to Exodus 20.11 and Psalm 146.6. Yet in describing God specifically as creator of the heaven and earth and the seas, Irenaeus points back to his critique of the Gnostic understanding of the formation of matter in 1.4.4., which contains the only other appearance of the word sea (*mare*/θάλασσα) in Book 1. The difference between fresh water and sea water was part of Irenaeus's argument from logical grounds against the Gnostics; in 1.10.1 Irenaeus restores the one God to the role of creator of everything, and does so through the first of his series of Scripture quotations, which in turn recall his prior critique of Gnostic exegesis from logical grounds.

Regarding the second person of the Trinity, Irenaeus professes faith in "one Jesus Christ, the son of God, who was enfleshed for our salvation." In this sentence Irenaeus continues in the same manner of presentation: "enfleshed," alludes to John 1:14,[44] which was the centerpiece of his exegesis in 1.9.1-4. This phraseology likewise presents an orthodox understanding of salvation. *Salus*/σωτηρία has appeared once before in *Against Heresies*, in 1.6.1, where Irenaeus accuses the Gnostics of teaching that "material substance is incapable of receiving salvation."[45] The hylics are not capable of being saved, in Irenaeus's interpretation of Gnostic teaching, because the world was created in order for the Savior to save the psychics, who need to discipline the body in order to be saved. In Irenaeus's description of the Son of God, there is no discussion of layers of construction: there is one Christ, not multiple Saviors, who actually took flesh, not a "body of ensouled substance." Furthermore, his description of Jesus taking flesh, despite the soteriological significance which Unger rightly gives

---

[44] John 1:14 :"καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο." Unger has chosen "enfleshed" rather than "incarnate" or "made flesh" apparently in an attempt to draw attention to the fact that Irenaeus is countering Gnostic understandings of salvation, though he does so without further explanation and without referring to any quotations from Irenaeus. Summarizing Irenaeus's point, Unger writes, "He assumed flesh, and all flesh is capable of salvation (Unger, footnote 4, 184)."

[45] "*non enim esse hylicon capacem salutis*/μὴ γὰρ εἶναι τὴν ὕλην δεκτικὴν σωτηρίας," SC 264: 92.

it, also recalls Irenaeus's exegesis in 1.9.3, where the same construction appears as part of his exhortation: "Certainly if any other of the Aeons had become flesh[46] for our salvation, in all probability the Apostle would have spoken of that other Aeon." While correct in his interpretation, Unger fails to appreciate the combination of exegesis, appropriation, and exposition which lie behind Irenaeus's description of Jesus.

Irenaeus's description of the role of the Spirit occupies the largest section of his exposition of the Rule of Truth.[47] While the role of the Spirit as the voice of the prophets is typically Irenaean, the Spirit is described as "preaching the economies," "κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας."[48] What follows is a long series of allusions to Scripture describing the events in the life of the earthly Jesus.[49] In Irenaeus's description of the Gnostic understanding of salvation, in 1.6.1 and 1.7.2-3, *dispositio*/οἰκονομία formed a key component of this system. In 1.6.1, as noted above, it is "from the economy" that Savior takes his body of ensouled substance.[50] This same description of the role of Economy Christ's fourfold creation is repeated in 1.7.2. Irenaeus also elaborates the Gnostic understanding of salvation in 1.7.2, describing how they believed that the "ensouled element suffered . . . because of the economy, in order that through him the Mother might display the type of the Christ on high." In Irenaeus's presentation, the Economy, the plan of salvation of the incarnate human person Jesus, is part of revealing the seed of knowledge planted in the offspring of Achamoth. By his description of the Spirit, the dispositio is firmly linked to the events of the human Jesus, as described in the Scriptures.

In 1.10.1, Irenaeus has expounded three elements of the theology central to *Against Heresies* and his response to Gnostic teaching: belief in the one God who is also the creator, salvation of the flesh through Jesus' incarnation, and of the revealing of this plan through the life of Christ as put forth in the Scriptures. The Rule of Truth, permeated throughout by

---

[46] "*caro factus est*/σὰρξ ἐγένετο," SC 264:143.

[47] For the functioning of the Spirit within the Rule of Truth, see Donovan, 11-12.

[48] SC 264: 155.

[49] For a description of the functioning of τὰς οἰκονομίας in Irenaeus, see Rousseau (SC 263: 223-24). Rousseau describes the "economies" of the Spirit as revealing the prefigurements of Christ in the Old Testament, with salvation accomplished through the work of the Son. This appears to be drawing too much of a distinction between the functioning of Father, Son, and Spirit.

[50] "*a dispositione autem circumdatum corpus, animalem habens substantiam*/ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας περιτεθεῖσθαι σῶμα, ψυχικὴν ἔχον οὐσίαν," SC 263: 92.

Biblical language, is the culmination of 1.1.1-1.10.2. The formulation of the Rule is likewise the product of Irenaeus's construction of theological vocabulary in his description of the systems of the Gnostics.

V. *Conclusion*

The thesis presented for this paper—that Irenaeus's Rule of Truth is best understood through the unfolding of his descriptions of Gnosticism—has taken the form of a commentary on *Against Heresies* 1.1-1.10, for the reason that Irenaeus's method and style of writing and argumentation demand such an approach. Attention to structure as well as vocabulary is essential in order to grasp what Irenaeus is doing. While Books 2-5 have undergone intense scrutiny (Books 3-5 in particular), Book 1, so far, has not. This paper has shown that, just as Irenaeus is no longer considered an inept editor of other people's works, so should Book 1 be liberated from form-critical study and debates about Irenaeus's historical reliability. It also provides a partial answer to the questions raised by Mary Ann Donovan some fifteen years ago concerning the role of the Rule within Book 1.[51] The Rule of Truth, though significant for the development of doctrine, is at its essence a product of the creation of theological discourse in *Against Heresies*, and part of the developing critique of Gnosticism which occupy Books 2-5.

The Episcopal Church Center
815 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10017-4594
USA

[51] See Donovan, "Irenaeus in Recent Scholarship," 223. Applying this thesis to the second formulation of the Rule of Truth, my contention is that 1.22 functions much in the same way as 1.10. To prove this would require a commentary on 1.13-21 as extensive as that on 1.1-1.10. To give but a few examples: the references to baptism and "redemptio", both leading into the Rule of Truth in 1.9.5, are repeated in 1.21.1. Whereas refuting Gnostic notions of salvation governs Irenaeus's description of Jesus and the Spirit, the question in 1.21 is redemption, countered in 1.22. Further work also needs to be done to show how the language/themes of Book 1 are taken up throughout the Books 3-5.

DAS VALENTINREFERAT DES IRENÄUS VON LYON (*HAER* I 11,1)

VON

PAUL SCHÜNGEL

Von den Kirchenvätern ist der Märtyrer Justin (Hinrichtung wohl 167) der einzige Zeitgenosse des römischen Gnostikers Valentin[1] (vermutlich ca. 100-160). Justin und Valentin waren in Rom tätig, sogar als Kollegen oder richtiger gesagt Konkurrenten: beide treten öffentlich[2] als "Philosophen" auf, sie lehren nämlich gegen Honorar "das rechte Leben". Beide nutzen sie die Lehrweise der damaligen Philosophie, vor allem platonischer Tradition. Allerdings tat Valentin dies auf sprachlich und intellektuell viel höherem Niveau als sein später gekommener Konkurrent. Justin erwähnt in seinen Schriften, soweit sie erhalten sind, Valentin nicht, wohl aber einmal "Valentinianer". Er diffamiert sie pauschal[3] zusammen mit anderen gnostischen Gruppen und zeigt auf diese Weise, wie wenig Verständnis er für die Anliegen und Lehren der Gnostiker hat.

---

[1] Christoph Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?* Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins, Tübingen 1992 (WUNT 65).

[2] Im Verhör antwortet Justin auf die Frage, wo er lehre: "Ich habe feste Bleibe (in den Räumen) eines gewissen Martinus über den Thermen des Timiotinos, und zwar schon all die Zeit, die ich hier bin. Es ist übrigens das zweite Mal, dass ich mich in der Stadt der Römer (als Lehrer) niedergelassen habe, und ich habe nie einen anderen Ort zur Versammlung erwogen als eben diesen. Und wer immer auch kommen wollte, um bei mir (zu lernen), ich habe mit ihm (nur) die Lehren der Wahrheit (τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας λογῶν) erörtert." (*M. Justin.* 3,3, bei Wartelle 228,6-13; Übersetzung Schüngel).

[3] *Dial.* 35,5f: "Sie lehren nämlich—die einen auf diese, die anderen auf jene Weise—Lästerungen gegen den Schöpfer des Weltalls und gegen Christus, dessen Ankunft von ihm geweissagt wurde, und gegen den Gott Abrahams, Isaaks und Jakobs. Mit keinem von ihnen haben wir Gemeinschaft; denn wir wissen, daß sie in ihrer Gottvergessenheit, Gottlosigkeit, Sündhaftigkeit und Lasterhaftigkeit auch Jesus nur dem Namen nach bekennen, nicht aber ihn verehren ..... Von jenen heißen die einen Marcianer, andere Valentinianer, andere Basilidianer, andere Satornilianer, die einen so, die andern anders; jeder hat seinen Namen vom Gründer des Systems." (Übersetzung Ph. Haeuser, BKV 33,52).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001 *Vigiliae Christianae* 55, 376-405

Wie ein christlicher "Philosoph" praktisch arbeitete, beschreibt sehr deutlich ein anderer Zeitgenosse der beiden, Hermas, der Autor des "Hirten". Hermas lebt ebenfalls in Rom und kennt diese christlichen Lehrer offenbar aus eigener Anschauung:

> Er[4] zeigte mir einige Leute, die auf einer (Schüler-)Bank saßen, und einen Mann, der auf seinem (Lehr-)Stuhl (καθέδρα) saß. Und er fragte mich: Siehst du die auf der Bank?—Ja, Herr, sagte ich.—Das sind, sagte er, Glaubende, doch der auf dem Stuhl ist ein Lügenprophet, der die Einsicht (διάνοια) der Diener Gottes verdirbt, aber nur bei den Zweiflern, nicht bei den (wahrhaft) Glaubenden. Diese Zweifler nun kommen (zu ihm) wie zu einem Wahrsager (ὡς ἐπὶ μάντιν) und fragen ihn aus, was denn nun mit ihnen sein soll.[5] Und jener falsche Prophet, der keinerlei Kraft vom Geist Gottes her in sich hat,[6] redet mit ihnen so, wie sie gefragt haben und wie es ihre üblen Begierden verlangen: so füllt er sie an mit dem, was sie (gerne haben) wollen. Denn er selbst ist leer und kann leeren Menschen nur Leeres antworten: wenn er gefragt wird, so gibt er Antwort ganz entsprechend der Leere des Fragers. Einige seiner Lehren jedoch trägt er ganz der (christlichen) Wahrheit gemäß vor.
>
> Mand XI (43,1-3) Übersetzung Schüngel

---

[4] "Er" ist der "Hirte", der angelus interpres. Die Dialogform ist literarisch nur dürftig ausgeführt, dennoch ist sie *konstitutiv* für den Text, denn dieser läuft auf das mandatum im letzten Satz hinaus: "Schenke also diesem Geist (der in der Gemeinde ungefragt und unverfügbar auftritt) Glauben, von dem anderen aber (der im bezahlten Privatunterricht auf persönliche Fragen antwortet) halte dich fern!" Der Dialog ist auf den Leser hin angelegt: Hermas vertritt in ihm die Rolle eines eher einfältigen Christen, der "Hirt" ist das alter ego des Autors, denn er spricht nicht ex autoritate angeli, sondern *wie ein Advokat* "beweist" er dem Leser anhand von Indizien, wo der rechte Geist spricht.

[5] Die Fragestellung τί ἄρα ἔσται αὐτοῖς ist doppeldeutig: In einer Schulstunde unter dem Thema εὖ ζῆν fragt sie nach dem anzustrebenden Dasein(sweg), der Leser aber soll sie nicht in diesem Kontext verstehen, sondern als Orakelanfrage. R. Joly übersetzt "Ceux qui doutent viennent à lui comme à un devin et le questionnent sur leur avenir." und kommentiert "Ainsi, les pseudoprophètes font oeuvre de divination." (SC 53, 193 mit Anm. 2).

[6] Irenäus nimmt diese Formulierung auf: "The one passage in Irenaeus in which the phrase τὸ κενὸν πνεῦμα occurs is A. H. I 13,2 (richtig: 13,4!). This is part of the account of the prophetic activities of the Gnostic teacher Marcus; between this account and the 11th Mandate there exist many similarities, to such an extend that we may safely assume that Irenaeus used materials of the 11th Mandate for his picture of Marcus." J. Reiling, *Hermas and the christian prophecy. A study of the 11th mandate* Leiden 1973 (NTSuppl 37) 41. Das bedeutet aber: Irenäus arbeitet hier nicht nach Quellen oder eigenen Beobachtungen, sondern sammelt die in seinen Kreisen umlaufenden Klischees, um sie den Gegnern anzuheften!

Hermas polemisiert heftig, aber ganz realistisch malt er die Szenerie: Es handelt sich um einen schulischen *Privatunterricht*, ganz so, wie auch Justin seinen Unterricht hielt (s. Anm. 2). Dann aber ist es sachwidrig, einen solchen Lehrer als "Lügen-*Propheten*" zu bezeichnen. Denn "Prophet" ist eine christliche Fachbezeichnung und meint den bezahlten Lehrer, der *in der Gemeindeversammlung* die LXX auslegt und an die Weisungen Jesu[7] erinnert. Ein christlicher "Philosoph" hat keinen derartigen Auftrag der Gemeinde und will ihn auch nicht haben (siehe Mand XI,14!). Er wendet sich vielmehr an Christen, denen die Belehrung in der Gemeinde nicht genügt, an "Zweifler",[8] die mit ihren Glaubensproblemen, öfter wohl mit ihren Lebensproblemen kompetentere Hilfe suchen und bereit sind, für solche Hilfe auch zu zahlen. Das alles weiß Hermas, auch weiß er, dass ein solcher privater Unterricht intellektuell anspruchsvoll ist und nichts mit Zukunfts-Wahrsagerei zu tun hat. Dennoch spielt er polemisch diese Karte. Offenbar hat er kaum Sach-Argumente gegen solche Lehrer, deshalb bleibt ihm nur, sie als obskurante Wahrsager[9] zu verleumden.

---

[7] Die Spezialstudie von Reiling (Anm. 6) kommt zum Ergebnis:" . . . it is clear that the church as a gathered community is indispensable if prophecy is to function properly" (176); diese Propheten "are not 'Pneumatiker' in a sense that they possess the spirit to a higher degree than the ordinary members of the church." (175).—Als ein spezieller Dienst in der Gemeinde verkündet und aktualisiert der Prophet die (atl.) Gottesoffenbarung (ein Beispiel dafür ist Barn 6,5-7,2, s. dazu Ferdinand R. Postmeier *Der Barnabasbrief*, Göttingen 1999 (KAV 8) 255-283). Dieser Prophetendienst in der Gemeinde hat nichts mit Zukunftsdeutung und Wahrsagerei zu tun. Allerdings hat das Verb προφητεύω im profanen Gebrauch durchaus die Bedeutung "wahrsagen, Zukünftiges enthüllen"; diese populäre Bedeutung nutzt Hermas für seine Polemik.

[8] Hermas behandelt den "Zweifel" thematisch in Mand IX, zunächst den Zweifel an der Gebetserhörung, dann aber einen grundsätzlicheren Zweifel: "Wende dich ganz ab vom Zweifelsinn und sei völlig Herr über ihn in allen Angelegenheiten, (denn du bist) gerüstet mit dem starken und mächtigen Christenglauben. Denn der Christenglaube verspricht alles, er erfüllt auch alles; der Zweifelsinn aber bezweifelt sogar sich selbst (ἡ διψυχία καταπιστεύουσα) und scheitert darum bei jeder Sache, die er unternimmt." (*PH* 39,10; Übersetzung Schüngel). In Mand XI sagt Hermas δίψυχοι . . . πυκνῶς μετανοοῦσιν (*PH* 43,4): "diese sind Zweifler und ändern ständig ihre Ansichten". Im damaligen kulturellen Kontext können damit nur Leute mit religiös-philosophischem Problembewusstsein gemeint sein. Bei der Homerlektüre im elementaren Schulunterricht war Skepsis gegenüber den Götterlehren ein wichtiges Unterrichtsziel und wurde von den Philosophen im höheren Unterricht vorausgesetzt—so theologisch die meisten Philosophen dann auch argumentierten. Die δίψυχοι sind also die gebildeten Intellektuellen und ihre Lehrer, die Philosophen.—Ausführlich zum "Zweifel" s. den Exkurs bei N. Brox *Der Hirt des Hermas* 1991 (KAV 7) 551-553 und den Exkurs zum "Oppositions-Begriff" Einfacheit (ἁπλότης) 500-502.

[9] "They go to him ὡς ἐπὶ μάντιν i.e. as the heathen go to a soothsayer. A little further,

Wer aber ist hier gemeint? In Rom gab es gewiss nicht viele *christliche* Philosophen zur Zeit des Hermas, der bekannteste und erfolgreichste von ihnen war Valentin. Hermas wirft dem Ungenannten vor, dass er arrogant auftrete: er beanspruche eine intellektuelle Führungsposition (πρωτοκαθηδρία), sei im Reden unbescheiden und wortreich (ἀναιδὴς καὶ πολύλαλος), auch lebe er auf großem Fuß (Mand XI,12). Er suche sich seine Kunden zusammen und gebe nur Privatunterricht (κατὰ γωνίαν αὐτοῖς προφητεύει = er gibt seine Wahrsagerei nur im Winkel (Mand XI,13)). Jeder zeitgenössische Leser des "Hirten", der die Verhältnisse in Rom kannte, musste bei dieser Schilderung vielleicht nicht ausschließlich, aber vor allem an Valentin[10] denken.

Etwa vierzig Jahre später, in den achtziger Jahren des 2. Jahrhunderts schreibt Irenäus von Lyon sein umfangreiches Werk "Entlarvung und Widerlegung der fälschlich sogenannten Gnosis". Darin behandelt er Valentin *ausdrücklich* nur einmal, nämlich im Buch I Kap. 11,1. Valentin ist längst Begründer einer eigenen Tradition, einer Schule[11] geworden. Irenäus verbirgt nicht seine polemische Einstellung gegenüber dieser Schule, er sagt

---

however, the author modifies his statement and writes that the double-minded μαντεύονται ὡς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη. Like μάντις this verb has a strong pagan connotation, and hence consulting the false prophet is tantamount to the sin of idiolatry." Reiling (Anm. 6) 34.

[10] Reiling (Anm. 6) 65 diskutiert die schon 1865 von Lipsius vorgetragenen These, "that the picture of the false prophet in Hermas fits the Gnostics perfectly." Er wendet ein, dass hier nicht Lehre, sondern Wahrsagerei gesucht und geboten werde, konzediert aber: "It is, however, conceivable that Hermas contains polemics against Gnosticism to such an extant that it is at least probable to see the false prophet as a representative of this movement." (65) Reiling behandelt dann ausdrücklich Valentin, kommt aber zum Ergebnis "that there is very little in Hermas which refers to controversies with Gnostic teachers" (66). Das ist richtig, hat aber einen einfachen Grund: Hermas kann und will nicht *argumentativ* auf die Lehren Valentins eingehen, denn er hat wohl keinen Zugang zu dessen Denken, obwohl beide ernsthafte und engagierte Christen sind, in der gleichen Stadt leben und in der gleichen Sprache (freilich mit sehr unterschiedlicher Kompetenz!) schreiben.

[11] Irenäus *Haer* I 30,15: *Tales quidem secundum eos sententiae sunt, a quibus velut Lernea hydra multiplex capitibus fera de Valentini scola generata est.*—Chr. Markschies hat den Relativsatz sehr problematisiert (Nochmals: Valentinus und die Gnostikoi *VigChr* 51 (1997) 179-187), er findet unverständlich, dass etwas zugleich *a quibus* und *de scola* entstand. Ich meine, Irenäus greift hier zur Kunstfigur der ἔλλειψις/*detractio*, die so aufzulösen ist: "Wie (aus dem Sumpf) die Lernäische Schlange entstand, ebenso entstand mit diesen (vielen Männern), die derartige Lehrsätze vorbringen, aus der Schule Valentins ein Ungeheuer, das (nun) viele Köpfe hat." Die Polemik zielt auf den jetzigen Zustand der Schule Valentins: die Vielzahl ihrer *capita* = Lehrautoritäten mache sie unglaubwürdig.

mit Nachdruck, worum es ihm geht: Er will aufzeigen, dass die Schüler Valentins sich ständig widersprechen. Etwas überraschend referiert er dann aber nicht Lehren der Schüler, sondern Lehrsätze Valentins, also—nach seiner Behauptung—Originaltexte[12] des Meisters. Einleitend gibt Irenäus an, welche Stellung und Bedeutung er Valentin persönlich zuschreibt:

> Ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης Γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως
> τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας,
> Οὐαλιντῖνος οὕτως ὡρίσατο·

Irenäus bezeichnet die gnostische Tradition als eine αἵρεσις,[13] das ist eine vom Christentum, wie er es vertritt, willkürlich abgespaltene Lehrauffassung. Mit ἀπό ist die *Herkunft* der Abspaltung benannt; Valentin ist πρῶτος, weil mit ihm diese Abspaltung angefangen[14] habe. Valentin habe die eine Kirche gespalten, indem er ihre[15] Grundlagen, d.h. ihre fundamentalen Lehrsätze *korrigierte* (μεθαρμόζω), er habe nämlich diesen Grundlagen für die Zwecke seines Lehrbetriebs (διδασκαλεῖον) ein neues Gepräge[16] gegeben.

---

[12] Markschies (Anm. 1) 263 bezweifelt, dass Irenäus solche Quellen hatte: "Bereits ungefähr zwanzig Jahre nach dem mutmaßlichen Ende von Valentins römischer Wirksamkeit lassen sich von der Lehrtätigkeit eines gefeierten altchristlichen Theologen nur noch kleine Bruchstücke auftreiben." Das ist unwahrscheinlich, sogar widerlegbar.—Nur G. Quispel hat, soweit ich sehe, darauf bestanden, dass *Haer* I 11,1 valentinisches Gut enthalte, so gutes sogar "that this short summary still furnishes a valid basis for the reconstruction of the original doctrine of Valentinus". (Valentinian Gnosis and the Apocryphon of John, in: *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* I Leiden 1980 (SHR 41/1) 123).

[13] Das ist damals ein Fachwort der Philosophen: die etablierten Philosophenschulen bezeichneten damit von ihrer Generallinie abweichende Lehren. Irenäus übernimmt mit diesem Sprachgebrauch diese Abwehrhaltung.

[14] Den gleichen Vorwurf der Traditionslosigkeit macht Irenäus *Haer* III 4,3: "Vor Valentin gab es keine Valentinianer . . ., noch irgend solche Leute bösartiger Gesinnung, wie wir sie vorhin erwähnten, bevor nicht die Anreger und Erfinder (*initiatores et inventores*) ihrer Perversion auftraten. Valentin kam nach Rom unter Hyginus, erreichte seinen Höhepunkt unter Pius und hielt sich bis Anicet." Hier datiert Irenäus den Beginn der αἵρεσις in die 30er Jahre des 2. Jahrhunderts! Andererseits kennt er wie schon Justin (*Apol* I 26) eine *successio*, die mit Simon Magus beginnt. Dann lautet das Ergebnis: "*A talibus patribus et proavis eos qui a Valentino sint, sicut ipsae sententiae et regulae ostendunt*" (*Haer* I 31,3).

[15] Nicht gnostische ἀρχαί (Glaubensgrundsätze), das wäre ja keine αἵρεσις gewesen! Andererseits formuliert Irenäus bewusst zweideutig.

[16] Irenäus nutzt das Bild vom Münzen-Prägen: In der Antike schlug man Münzen nicht nur aus vorbereiteten Metallstücken, sondern bisweilen auch aus Münzen (Überprägungen). Irenäus meint: Valentin habe der echten Münze "Christentum" seine eigene Prägung (ἴδιον χαρακτήρ) gegeben, also gewaltsam und mit krimineller Energie das wahre Christentum verfälscht.—Das gleiche Bild auch *Haer* I 24,7 28,1 und II 31,1.

Erst zuletzt nennt er Valentin namentlich und erklärt, dieser habe seine Korrektur erreicht, indem er neue ἀρχαί *definiert habe*; entsprechend beginnt der erste Satz des Referats mit dem εἶναι einer Definition! Ich löse den absichtsvoll verschachtelten Satz auf und übersetze:

> Der erste aus der Abspaltung (vom Christenglauben), die man gnostisch nennt, ist Valentin. Denn er hat die (christlichen) Grundlagen korrigiert, indem er sie für seine Lehrtätigkeit[17] (gewaltsam) umprägte. Dazu hat er (diese Grundlagen) in folgender Weise neu festgesetzt:

Irenäus kündigt damit ein Referat über die "neu definierten Lehrgrundsätze" Valentins an, tatsächlich folgen Definitionssätze. Aber diese Sätze machen auf den Leser den Eindruck wirrer, unverständlicher Fantasie. Das ist Absicht. Irenäus gibt sich keine Mühe, Valentins Lehre zu verstehen oder gar zu erläutern. Der Kirchenvater will nicht informieren, sondern *desinformieren*; er will nicht Grundpositionen des wichtigsten Gegners skizzieren, sondern ihn als eigensinnigen, fantasierenden Wirrkopf *lächerlich machen*. Genaugenommen ist das Valentinreferat *Haer* I 11,1 nicht Polemik, sondern es ist *Agitation*.[18]

Weil die Dinge so stehen, halte ich das folgende Vorgehen für geboten: Man muss die redaktionelle Arbeit des Irenäus abtrennen von den Texten und Motiven, die er von Valentin übernommen hat.[19] Da erweislich ist, dass die Texte/Motive bei Valentin in verschiedenem Zusammenhang standen, muss jedes Textstückchen bzw. Motiv für sich genommen werden: dort einen Zusammenhang, gar ein "System" zu finden, das ist eine der falschen Fährten, auf die Irenäus locken will. Weiter muss man versuchen, in Kenntnis der Argumentationsweise Valentins und im Wissen um seine theologischen Anliegen *Sachkritik* an den einzelnen Texten bzw. Motiven zu üben, das heißt zu prüfen, ob sie zur Argumentation und Lehre der

---

[17] Irenäus unterstellt: Valentin ging unter die Philosophen, also auf den öffentlichen Markt; um da erfolgreich zu sein (und das war er!), musste er Neues, Sensationelles bieten.

[18] Das wird besonders deutlich, wenn man auf die Fortsetzung achtet: Irenäus berichtet *Haer* I 11,2 kurz von einem gewissen Sekundus und seinen Korrekturen am angeblichen "System" Valentins, dann ausführlich von der Lehre eines Ungenannten, den Irenäus gewiss erfunden hat, denn dessen Lehre besteht in Benennungswillkür. Diese nutzt der Kirchenvater dann in 11,4 für eine drastische "Verkürbissung" (ein damals arg abgenutzter Gag der Parodie), in 11,5 rührt er einem wirren Begriffs-Salat an. Das alles ist populärer Klamauk.

[19] Natürlich ist dieser Grundsatz allgemein anerkannt. Was Markschies (Anm. 1) 367 Anm. 232-234 aufzählt bzw. in der Übersetzung 409-411 bietet, ist nur die "Irenäische Rahmung"; man muss aber gerade die versteckten Bearbeitungen der Quellentexte herauszufinden.

Fragmente passen oder nicht. Leider kann man nicht die erste methodische Forderung erfüllen und dann erst zur zweiten vorrücken: man muss sie schon ständig kombinieren.

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 1. Satz des Referats

a Εἶναι Δυάδα ἀνονόμαστον,
Es sei eine unnennbare Zweiheit,
b ἧς τὸ μέν τι καλεῖσθαι Ἄρρητον, τὸ δὲ Σιγήν·
von der das eine "Unsagbarer" genannt wird, das andere "Schweigen";
c ἔπειτα ἐκ ταύτης τῆς Δυάδος δευτέραν Δυάδα προβεβλῆσθαι,
aus dieser Zweiheit sei dann eine zweite hervorgesprossen,
d ἧς τὸ μέν τι Πατέρα ὀνομάζει, τὸ δὲ Ἀλήθειαν·
von der er (= Valentin) das eine "Vater" nennt, das andere "Wahrheit".
e ἐκ δὲ τῆς Τετράδος ταύτης καρποφορεῖσθαι
Aus eben dieser Vierheit sind Früchte hervorgebracht worden,
Λόγον καὶ Ζωήν, Ἄνθρωπον καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν.
nämlich "Logos" und "Leben", "Mensch" und "Kirche".
f Εἶναί τε ταύτην Ὀγδοάδα πρώτην.
Es sei dies die erste "Achtheit".

Die Satzperiode wird in oratio obliqua vorgetragen: Irenäus referiert die Entwicklung der ersten "Ogdoas". Kennzeichnend für die Gattung ist das vorangestellte und im Schlusssatz f wiederholte εἶναι: Irenäus behauptet, er referiere philosophische Definitionen. Nach den Fragmenten ist aber sicher, dass Valentin nicht deduktiv nach Definitionen dozierte, sondern mit anschaulicher Bildlichkeit *paränetisch* unterrichtete. Wenn Irenäus, wie er behauptet, hier Grundsätze Valentins referiert, so hat er *ihre literarische Gattung verschoben*!

Das primäre konstitutive Element dieser Periode ist wohl nicht das Zahlenschema, sondern der Vorgang, den die Verben προβάλλω ("hervorsprossen, einen Zweig treiben", lat.: *emittere*)[20] und καρποφορέω ("Früchte bringen/tragen", lat.: *fructificari*) bezeichnen. Das Zahlenschema hat, vermute ich, erst Irenäus in den Vordergrund gespielt, um auf diese Weise die Bedeutung des Textes zu verschieben und den Leser auf eine Spur zu setzen, die in die Irre führt. Denn Irenäus redet im nächsten Satz von zehn bzw. zwölf Kräften, aber man versteht nicht, was das soll. Wenn

[20] Üblich ist die Übersetzung "emanieren". Dies ist ein Fachwort der Philosophie, das Plotin in einem sehr speziellen Sinne gebraucht hat. Weder Valentin noch Irenäus können Plotin, der ca. 205-270 lebte, gelesen haben. Wichtiger ist: Valentin nimmt nicht wie z.B. SapSal 7,25 das (archetypische) Bild von der rinnenden Quelle auf, sondern er wählt als ein Sprachkenner bewusst προβάλλω und καρποφορέω, denn er will die *vegetativen* Bilder, die diese Worte malen. Wer *Valentin* verstehen will, muss seine Bildwahl respektieren.

man diese Angabe zu interpretieren versucht, wozu die Zahlen (und die Paralleltexte *Haer* I 1,1 und 17,1.2) geradezu verlocken, sitzt man schon in der Falle der Desinformationen, die Irenäus aufgestellt hat: man möchte den Aufbau der hier skizzierten Jenseitswelt verstehen und das "System" Valentins begreifen. Nimmt man jedoch die beiden Verben in 1c und e als das primäre konstitutive Element des Valentintextes, so steht fest, dass hier das eindrucksvolle *Bild* fruchttragender Zweige oder ährentragender Halme vorgestellt wird, genauer gesagt ein Doppelbild: Zweige wachsen heraus und ihre Früchte werden präsentiert. Solch anschauliches Formulieren passt weit besser zu Valentin als schulgemäße Definitionssätze. Weiter fällt auf, dass die beiden Verben durchaus gegen die Natur der Sache passivisch gebraucht werden. Ich verstehe dieses Passiv als *pass. divinum*. Das entspricht Valentins Redeweise, denn dieser war sehr bemüht, von Gott und seinem Handeln nicht direkt zu sprechen. Als Träger des göttlichen Hervorbringens bezeichnet Irenäus eine "unnennbare Zweiheit", die allerdings im erläuternden Relativsatz doch benannt wird: zeigt das nicht, dass hier recht sorglos geklittert worden ist? Jedenfalls kann Valentin nicht von einer göttlichen "Dyas"[21] gesprochen haben. Im Gegensatz zu dieser "Dyas" in 1a ist im Satz 3 von einer einzigen "Tiefe"[22] die Rede. Gesetzt, diese "Tiefe", verstanden als Gottesbenennung, sei ursprünglich der Handelnde gewesen, dann kann man das Passiv durch die Umschreibung mit "lassen" gut ausdrücken: Die "Tiefe" lässt "Unsagbar" und "Schweigen" hervorsprossen. Das wäre wohl eine sinnvolle Aussage, aber kein Bild. Bleibt man beim pass. divinum des Textes und bemüht man sich um lakonische Kürze, dann muss man formulieren:

> Als Zweige werden getrieben "Unsagbar und "Schweigen", "Vater" und "Wahrheit", als Früchte werden hervorgebracht "Logos" und "Leben", "Einzelmensch" und "Gemeinde der Berufenen",

griechisch—*als visio* und im Chiasmus formuliert—hieß es wohl:

> *ὸρᾶται/βλέπω*[23]
> Ἄρρητος καὶ Σιγὴ Πατὴρ καὶ Ἀλήθεια προβεβλῆσαι
> καρποφορεῖσθαι Λόγος καὶ Ζωὴ Ἄνθρωπος καὶ Ἐκκλησία.

---

[21] "Schwierigkeiten bereitet auch die dualistische Konzeption des Abschnitts 1, die *Haer* I 11,1 zwar mit dem valentinianischen System 'A' verbindet, aber kaum mit der monistischen Tendenz der Fragmente und Tertullians verglichen werden kann." (Markschies (Anm. 1) 377 mit Fußnote 292).

[22] Darauf verweist auch Markschies (Anm. 1) 371 Anm. 256.

[23] Ich bin nicht der Ansicht, dass das verbum videndi ausgedrückt war; es ergab sich selbstverständlich aus dem NcI.

Diese hypothetische, aber den Wortlaut unangetastet lassende Rekonstruktion ergibt eine völlig neue Textgattung: *eine Meditationsanleitung*. Eine solche Anleitung hat ihren Sitz im Leben im seelsorglich ausgerichteten Unterricht. Valentin hat nicht Definitionen vorgetragen, um daraus wie Euklid in seinen "Elementen" Schritt für Schritt zwingende Schlüsse zu ziehen, sondern er hat, wie die Fragmente ausweisen, psychologisch geschickt unterrichtet, um seine Hörer mit dichterischer Kraft zur Meditation und Selbsteinsicht zu führen. Dabei ging es nicht um intellektuelles Bescheid-Wissen, sondern um ermutigende Antworten auf existentielle Fragen und Lebensnöte. Valentin musste seinen Klienten etwas mit nach Hause geben, wovon sie zehren konnten. Hier tat er dies mit einem dichterischen Zweizeiler, der leicht zu behalten[24] ist. Der eine ganz jenseitige Gott bleibt unsichtbar, ungenannt und schlechthin verborgen; der meditierende Gnostiker aber erkennt vier "Namen", die bei der Meditation "herausgetrieben sind" (προβεβλῆσθαι in 1c: resultatives gr. Perfekt). Die "Namen" sind nicht die Sache selbst, sondern sind die (durchaus subjektiven, nämlich an die Meditation gebundenen) An-Sichten, die auf den einen schlechthin Un-Sagbaren[25] verweisen. Die vier Namen bilden zwei Paare: "Unsagbar"

---

[24] Antiker Unterricht war papierlos! Die Schüler hatten nur Wachstäfelchen, sie mussten auswendig lernen. Gute Lehrer brachten den Merkstoff in poetische Form, besonders beliebt waren Hexameter. Vier Hexameterzeilen, die man in Rom fand (wissensch. Katalogisierung: ICUR VI,297a), stammen wahrscheinlich aus Valentins Unterricht, s. dazu zuletzt Paul Schüngel, Ein gnostisches Credo—in Stein gehauen! *RQ* 93 (1998) 145-155.

[25] Auf den ersten Blick ganz anders interpretiert Roelof van den Broek: "The principle of androgynos duality is first expressed in Immortal Man and his Sophia. It is to such a concept that Plato's view of the Good as producing Nous and Aletheia could be applied. Valentinus has transformed the principle of duality and fecundity into the deepest ground of being itself, by changing its monadic essence into Bythos and Sige." (Jewish and Platonic Speculations in Early Alexandrian Theology: Eugnostos, Philo, Valentinus, Origen, in: R. van den Broek, *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity* NHMS 39 (1996) 117-130, 128.) Diese Interpretation ist zwar viel differenzierter und verständnisvoller als die Behauptung der Kirchenväter vom doppelten Gott, aber auch sie läuft auf eine dualistische Aufspaltung des Gottesbegriffes hinaus. Das aber verkennt die Intention Valentins. Denn dieser will in der Ogdoas-Formel das Offenbarungswirken des biblischen Gottes darstellen, jedoch nicht als angeblich objektiv in der Bibel gefundene *Heilsgeschichte*, sondern als im Verständnis der Verständigen sich entfaltende *visio* der Zuwendung dieses einen und einzigen Gottes. Doch vertritt, dem Anschein des zitierten Satzes entgegen, van den Broek gar keine Interpretation, die zu meiner konträr ist: Er verweist als Initialzündung einer langen Denktradition auf Platos Spekulation, dass aus (der Idee von) einem Guten als erstes das Ideenpaar Nous und Aletheia entspringen. Das Grundproblem der Gnostiker bezüglich der Gotteslehre benennt van den

und "Schweigen" bilden ein Paar, das sich ergänzt, denn nur "Schweigen" ist die richtige Antwort auf "Unsagbar"—ein höchst beherzigenswerter theologischer Grundsatz![26] Ebenso entspricht "Vater" in dem Sinne, in dem Jesus diese Gottesanrede brauchte, der "Wahrheit" im alttestamentlich-weisheitlichen Sinne: "emet" ist, was das Leben fest macht bei jedem, der gelernt und verinnerlicht hat, wer der schlechthin gute Vater der Verkündigung Jesu ist. Die jeweiligen "Partner" antworten einander, die beiden "Paare" jedoch stehen in dialektischer Spannung, denn "Vater" hebt ja in einem gewissen Sinne "Unsagbar" auf. Und ganz genau so ist es bei den "Früchten", also *den in der Empirie*[27] *sich zeigenden Wirkungen* (καρποφορεῖσθαι in 1e: gr. duratives Präsens): auch da sind je zwei Partner, die sich mögen, ja aufeinander angewiesen sind, die beiden Paare aber stehen in dialektischer Spannung.[28] Die Schönheit des Sprachbildes kann man im Deutschen

---

Broek so: "Eugnostos's real problem is how the monadic and unchangeable being of the ineffable God *can be conceived* as becoming an active and multiplying being" (118, Hervorhebung Schüngel). Von Philo referiert er 120: "According to Philo, the name of God represents the creative and beneficent power of God, and the name of Lord his royal and punishing power"—was andere Juden dann herumdrehten. Das Titelthema ist "Speculations", der Ausgangspunkt dabei ist immer: die "monadic essence" selbst ist nicht sagbar! Plato und Philo und die großen gnostischen Theologen beachten sorgfältig, was kirchliche Theologen meist vergessen: Von Gott selbst kann man nicht reden, sondern nur von den Gottesvorstellungen und -erfahrungen der Menschen. Wenn man dieses Wagnis unternimmt, sollte man wissen, was man tut; der Leser aber sollte an der Dialektik und der immer mitschwingenden ehrfürchtigen Ironie merken, dass solche Rede unter einem ihr eigentümlichen *Vorbehalt* steht.

[26] Die *Exzerpte aus Theodot* 29 formulieren in der gleichen Bildlichkeit und Wortwahl: "Sige, sagen sie, die die Mutter aller ist, die von der "Tiefe" hervorgebracht sind, schwieg von dem, was sie von dem Unsagbaren nicht aussprechen konnte; was sie aber begriff, das hat sie als Unbegreifliches ausgesprochen." (Übersetzung W. Foerster, *Die Gnosis* Bd. 1,292 (BAWC.AC ²1979)) Vergl. die Einsicht Platos: "Also den Urheber und Vater dieses Weltalls aufzufinden, ist schwer, nachdem man ihn aber auffand, ihn allen zu verkünden, unmöglich." (Tim 28c, Übersetzung Schleiermacher/Müller; ebenso 7. Brief 341c).

[27] Valentin musste seinen Hörern echte Hilfe in ihren persönlichen Nöten bieten und darum auf ihre Erfahrungen zu sprechen kommen. Die Gnostiker haben nicht um der Spekulation willen spekuliert, sondern um problembewussten Hörern überzeugende Antworten geben zu können. Man sollte Irenäus nicht glauben, wenn er *Haer* I 4,3 behauptet, die Leute zahlten "hohe Honorare" für "eine ganz abgestandene Theatergeschichte und pure Fantasieerzählung": es ist Irenäus, der die sehr ernsthaften seelsorglichen Bemühungen der Gnostiker als τραγῳδία πολλὴ λοιπόν und φαντασία darstellt!

[28] Diesen Text von zwei Zeilen meditativ auszuschöpfen würde mehrere Seiten, ja einen eigenen Aufsatz erfordern. "Logos" (Urbedeutung: was eine Rechnung aufgehen

nicht voll wiedergeben, denn sie beruht auch darauf, dass die jeweiligen Partner dem grammatischen Geschlecht nach männlich und weiblich sind, also ein "Ehepaar", eine "Syzygie"[29] bilden. Das kann man in der Übersetzung nicht nachahmen. Doch kommt es darauf nicht an, sondern darauf, alle Pole des Sprachbildes meditativ gleichmäßig in der Schwebe zu halten. Den Reichtum dieses Zweizeilers finde ich bewundernswert,[30] eine solche Verdichtung schafft nur ein Genie.[31]

In späteren Auseinandersetzungen wurde die "Ogdoas" zum Bekenntnisartikel. Ein Beispiel dafür ist die Lehrschrift *Testimonium Veritatis* (NHC

---

lässt und einen Satz verstehbar macht) ist hier vermutlich die das Leben *stimmig* machende Einsicht, und entsprechend ist "Leben" eine Existenz aus der Selbsterfahrung einer "Meerestiefe an Vollmacht" (s. unten Anm. 63). Einer, der von diesem Paar bestimmt ist, ist ein ἄνθρωπος, der sich dieser Vollmacht und damit seines Auftrags bewusst geworden ist. Nach gnostischer Auffassung ist er *gerade dadurch* ein mit seiner Singularität und essentiellen Einsamkeit einverstandener Mensch, ein μοναχός, wie das EvThom sagt. Zugleich mit solchen Menschen entsteht ἐκκλησία, das ist "die berufene Gemeinschaft", die solche Menschen einerseits brauchen *und* andererseits ermöglichen: die Gemeinde wird konstituiert durch gemeinsames Werten und Handeln, durch wechselseitiges Ermutigen, Bedenken und Erinnern derjenigen, die mit jesuanischer Liebeskraft bevollmächtig sind.

[29] Es war vermutlich Valentin selbst, der das (uralte, archetypische) Denken in "Syzygien" für die Gnosis fruchtbar machte. Weil Valentin ein an Plato geschulter dialektischer Denker ist, nutzt er die Geschlechterpolarität als *Darstellungsmittel.*

[30] Der Aufsatz Ogdoas als ein Symbol der Auferstehung von Reinhart Staats (*VigChr* 26 (1972), 29-52) ist auch heute noch lesenswert wegen seiner reichen kulturgeschichtlichen Informationen. Im Kleindruck sagt R. Staats S. 38 m.E. völlig richtig: "Es kann demzufolge nicht ausgeschlossen werden, daß die Gnosis in ihrer Vorliebe für Zahlenspekulationen auch für ihre Ogdoaslehre etliches aus der philosophisch-heidnischen Umwelt aufgenommen hat, die nicht minder zahlenfreudig war; aber der bewegende theologische Impuls für die Hochschätzung der Acht muß doch aus einer anderen Richtung kommen."

[31] Auch Basilides wird die Formulierung einer Ogdoas zugeschrieben. W. Löhr übersetzt das als Nr. 9 gezählte Fragment so: "Basilides aber nimmt an, daß die Gerechtigkeit und ihre Tochter, der Friede, als Stützen in die Ogdoas eingefügt bleiben." (Winrich A. Löhr, *Basilides und seine Schule* (WUNT 83) 1996, 165) Ich stimme der Übersetzung und zugrundeliegenden Lesung zu, nur möchte ich das δέ unübersetzt lassen: es bezeichnet einen neuen Gedanken, nicht aber einen Gegensatz. Gut verständlich ist, dass Basilides "Gerechtigkeit und ihre Tochter Frieden" als "Stützen" bezeichnete, nämlich als Stützen des rechten Lebens. Schwieriger scheint mir das μένειν. Nimmt man es prägnant als "bestehenbleiben", so liegt wohl eine Kritik an der Ogdoas Valentins vor: Basilides beharrt gegen Valentin auf einer älteren, herkömmlichen Achter-Aufzählung. Diese war nicht so perfekt in Paaren gegliedert, denn griechisch sind "Gerechtigkeit und Friede" Feminina.—Dass die Anhänger des Basilides und die Valentinianer je ihre eigene Ogdoas haben, weiß Irenäus *Haer* II 16,4.

IX,3), die aus der Zeit um 200[32] stammt. Sie ist schlecht erhalten, der hier interessierende Abschnitt sogar nur in Einzelsätzen. Der Satz 55,1-5 verteidigt die Ogdoas als "Ort des Heilwerdens" gegen solche, die gar nicht wissen, was "Heilsein" ist. Deutlicher ist 56,1-9: Valentin, der namentlich genannt wird, und ein "Vollender seines Wegs", dessen Name leider weggefallen ist, lehrten die Ogdoas (als "Ort des Heilwerdens"). Der Autor macht scharf Front gegen Schüler Valentins und des "Vollenders", die nach seiner Ansicht *dieses Gut* (kopt. *piagathon*, der Artikel *pi-* ist demonstrativ) aufgegeben haben und eine εἴδωλον-Frömmigkeit pflegen: gemeint sind Valentinianer, die den kirchlichen Christuskult mitmachen. Der Autor hält die in der Ogdoas formulierte Soteriologie für unvereinbar mit der kirchlichen Christologie, die "Häretiker" dagegen halten die Teilnahme an der kirchlichen Christusverehrung für hinnehmbar.—Valentin selbst hatte dieses Problem noch nicht: Wenn er sich in Rom eine Hausgemeinde suchte, die das Eucharistieformular der Didache gebrauchte, und wenn dort die Oden Salomos gesungen wurden, dann hatte nicht nur das Theologenherz Valentins seine Freude an diesem Gottesdienst, sondern auch sein Dichterherz.

Beobachtungen und Erläuterungen zum 2. Satz

a Καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ Λόγου καὶ τῆς Ζωῆς δέκα δυνάμεις λέγει προβεβλῆσθαι,
Auch, sagt er, seien aus "Logos" und "Leben" zehn Kräfte hervorgesprossen,
b καθὼς προειρήκαμεν,
wie wir (= Irenäus) schon vorher erläutert haben,
c ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας δώδεκα,
aus "Mensch" und "Kirche" aber zwölf,
d ὧν μίαν ἀποστᾶσαν καὶ ὑστερήσασαν τὴν λοιπὴν πραγματείαν πεποιῆσθαι.
von denen eine dadurch, dass sie hinabgefallen und in Mangel geraten war, den weiteren Ablauf ausgelöst habe.

Dieser rekapitulierende Satz ist ganz von Irenäus gebildet worden. Nur der Teilsatz 2d, der die "Weisheit" (vergl. Irenäus *Haer* I 2,2) als eine vom Baum heruntergefallene und dadurch in Probleme geratene "Frucht" schildert, könnte ein Bild Valentins aufnehmen. Wenn man dieses Bild Valentin zuschreibt, lehrte (schon) er[33] den "Sophiamythos". Was der kunstreiche

---

[32] Birger A. Pearson, *Nag Hammadi Codices IX und X* (Leiden 1981) NHS 15, 120: ".... sometime at the end of the second century or the beginning of the third."

[33] Zu dieser—ich meine in ihrer Relevanz überbewerteten—Frage s. Markschies (Anm. 1) 377f. Markschies erwägt 378, "ob nicht die ganze Erzählung vom mißlungenen Versuch der Engel, einen Menschen zu schaffen (Frgm. 1), als >Hypostasierung< der biblischen Erzählung vom Fall gedeutet werden muß und genau die Stelle ..... einnimmt, an der bei den Valentinianern der Sophia-Fall steht."—Keineswegs ist den

Mythos erzählt, ist gemeint als Beschreibung des Ist-Zustandes: das mit Leidenschaft gesuchte und darum wahnhafte Wissen nimmt alle Menschen gefangen, sie müssen auf den Weg zum Offenbarungswissen der erlösenden γνῶσις *gerufen* werden.

Die "zehn" und die "zwölf Kräfte" zählt Irenäus nicht mehr auf, sondern verweist zurück auf sein Parallelreferat *Haer* I 1,2. Die meisten der dort aufgeführten "Paargenossen" sind so an den Haaren herbeigezogen, dass mir nur eine Erklärung einleuchtend erscheint: Irenäus hat sie mutwillig gebildet, um ein den Valentinianern teures Prinzip zu Tode zu reiten. Also ist die dortige Zahlenspielerei (2 + 2 + 4 + 10 + 12 = 30)—jedenfalls in dieser Form!—seine Erfindung. Seine Absicht ist, die Zahlenspielerei so auszuziehen, dass sie zum reizvollen Rätsel wird. Das ist ihm glänzend gelungen: Generationen von Gelehrten haben sich bemüht, hier Geist und Sinn, Stufenbau und Entsprechungen zu finden. Ich weigere mich, dabei mitzumachen.

Mit seinem Rückverweis auf *Haer* I 1,2 erreicht Irenäus aber noch mehr! Denn er schließt den Bericht dort ab mit der Behauptung: "Dies sind die dreißig Äonen ihrer Irrlehre, verschwiegen und nicht bekanntgegeben. Das ist ihr unsichtbares und pneumatisches Pleroma, dreifach unterteilt in eine Ogdoas (Achtheit), Dekas (Zehnheit) und Dodekas (Zwölfheit)."[34] Daran will Irenäus den Leser erinnern. Folgt man seinem Hinweis, geht man in die Irre: die folgenden Sätze über die "Äonen" und das "Pleroma" sind unverständlich. Das ist natürlich die Absicht des Referenten, der ausdrücklich erklärt hatte, er wolle aufzeigen, wie unbeständig und haltlos (ἄστατος) die Vorstellungen der Gnostiker seien.

Ich ignoriere deshalb den Verstehenshinweis und Interpretationszusammenhang, den Irenäus bietet. Ich prüfe stattdessen zunächst am 7. Satz des Referats, ob er aus sich selbst verständlich ist und die ursprüngliche Bedeutung von "Äonen" bei Valentin erkennen lässt.

Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 7. Satz

a Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ ἅγιον ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας φησὶ προβεβλῆσθαι εἰς ἀνάκρισιν καὶ καρποφορίαν τῶν αἰώνων, ἀοράτως εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσιόν·
b δι οὗ τοὺς αἰῶνας καρποφορεῖν τὰ φυτὰ τῆς ἀληθείας.

Engeln ihr Versuch mißlungen, vielmehr haben sie ihr Werk nachträglich "verpfuscht" (Text in Anm. 50!): es liegt am Hörer, ob er sich als solch ein "Verpfuschter", aber zum Heilwerden Aufgerufener begreift. Eine solche Erzählung (richtiger: ein haggadischer Midrasch des Plurals in Gen 1,26) ist ja wahr nur für den, den sie betroffen macht. Nur dann wird sie angeeignet!

[34] Irenäus *Haer* I 1,3; Übersetzung N. Brox, *Irenäus von Lyon*, Freiburg 1993 (Fontes christiani 8,1) 131.

In diesem Satzgefüge will Irenäus die Pneumatologie Valentins referieren. Noch vor der Übersetzung ist zu fragen: Handelte der referierte Text vom Wirken des Heiligen Geistes in dieser Welt oder von seinem Wirken an Äonen in einem transzendenten Lichtreich, dem Pleroma?[35] Sinnvoll und verständlich sind diese Sätze nur, wenn von konkreten Menschen in dieser Welt die Rede ist: nur bei ihnen kann man vom Fruchtbarwerden und Fruchtbringen sprechen. Der Plural αἰῶνες ist damals durchaus übliche Bezeichnung der Lebenszeit von Menschen.[36] Das Wort ἀνάκρισις (= Verhör) jedoch ist als irritierende Zutat des Kirchenvaters anzusehen und zu streichen. Irenäus referiert als Lehre Valentins:

> Die Wahrheit lasse den Heiligen Geist hervorsprießen, damit Menschen während ihrer Lebenszeit (verhört werden und) Früchte bringen. Dadurch nämlich, dass der Heilige Geist unsichtbar in das Leben solcher Menschen eindringe, trügen diese als ihre Früchte die Gewächse der Wahrheit.

Inhaltlich ist dies die gleiche Lehre vom menschlichen Heil- und Tüchtigwerden, wie sie Valentins 2. Fragment[37] vorträgt. Der Heilige Geist wird innerhalb dieser Lebenszeit in Menschen tätig als Urteilen und Handeln aus der *Gnosis* des in vier "Namen" Meditierten (s. oben S. 9). Dieser Geist ist von sich aus aktiv und bringt in die wahre Existenz: Wo er ins Herz gedrungen ist, da bringt die Wahrheit ihre Früchte, das ist, sie wird empirisch wirksam. Der Bildgebrauch entspricht Valentin, denn er bevorzugt vegetative Bilder (siehe Anm. 20).

Diese Pneumatologie passt gut zu Valentin. Aber referiert Irenäus wörtlich? Zeigt er wirklich den Sprachgebrauch Valentins? Anhand der Fragmente kann man diese Frage nicht klären, denn sie bieten nur einmal den Singular Αἰών[38] als Gottesbenennung. Wenn Irenäus hier den Sprachgebrauch Valen-

---

[35] "Gemeint ist das transzendente Lichtreich, in dem die Äonen sind, die eigentliche Wirklichkeit, die Kontrastgröße zur hiesigen Welt." Fußnote zu Irenäus *Haer* 1,1 erster Satz bei Brox (Anm. 34) 129.

[36] LJS 45: I. lifetime, life. . . . II. long space of time. . . . Die biblischen und patristischen Wörterbücher irritieren mit ihrer (aus Übersetzungsnot geborenen!) Bedeutungsvielfalt des Wortes, s. auch den langen "Exkurs III: Zeitgenössische Aion-Vorstellungen und Valentins Aion-Begriff" bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 157-166.—Wichtig ist, den Plural des Wortes vom Singular-Gebrauch zu unterscheiden. Im Barbelo-Referat des Irenäus steht der Satz "In diesem Zustand ruhen alle (Äonen) und preisen den großen Äon" (*Haer* I 29,3), das entspricht ganz dem bei Valentin vermuteten unterschiedlichen Gebrauch von Singular und Plural.

[37] Ausführlichere Besprechung dieses Fragments weiter unten (S. 25).

[38] Dieses Gottes*epitheton* (fehlorientierend immer noch "Gott Aion" RGG⁴ 1,234; informativer: Jarl Fossum, The Myth of the Eternal Rebirth *VigChr* 53 (1999) 305-315) hat

tins wiedergibt, muss dieser die Gottesbenennung Αἰών (= der Eine, der Lebenszeit gibt) und den Plural αἰῶνες (= die Zeitlichen) als Menschenbenennung dialektisch einander gegenübergestellt haben. Ein solcher Sprachgebrauch würde gut zum intellektuell anspruchsvollen Unterricht Valentins passen. Tatsächlich ist dieser Gebrauch nachweisbar, zwar nicht in den Fragmenten, wohl aber in der Valentintradition, z.B. im "Evangelium der Wahrheit".[39] Dies ist eine irenische Apologie,[40] die entweder von Valentin selbst stammt oder in den engeren Umkreis seiner Schule gehört.

Irenäus hat nicht alle Spuren des valentini(ani)schen Gebrauchs von αἰῶνες getilgt. Er referiert *Haer* I 2,1-4 die "Unfallgeschichte des Äons, der von der Leidenschaft überwältigt wurde und auf der Suche nach dem Vater um ein Haar verloren gegangen wäre wie in einem Gestrüpp" (*Haer* I 3,1). Erst wenn der Äon durch eine jenseitige, ihn begrenzende Kraft zur Umkehr gebracht wird, nimmt das Drama einen guten Ausgang, der alle betrifft:

Valentin aus dem ägyptischen Alexandria mitgebracht. Die Forschung versteht freilich diesen Aion anders, prägnant formuliert bei Holzhausen: "Erst im fünften Fragment des Gnostikers Valentin (2. Jh. n. Chr.) findet sich eine neue Position. Er nennt den Kosmos Abbild (εἰκών) des lebendigen Aion.(Anm. Holzhausen: Vergl. Plato Tim. 92c: die Welt als sichtbares Lebewesen ist Abbild des geistigen Lebewesens.). Aion wird hier zur eigenständigen Wesenheit als Bezeichnnung für den Ideenkosmos." (J. Holzhausen *Das Corpus Hermeticum Deutsch*, Stuttgart 1997, 120). Thema des 5. Fragments ist aber nicht das Verhältnis der Ideenwelt zur Sinnenwelt, sondern die Vertrauenswürdigkeit der (als böse) erlebten Welt, ob nämlich doch ein guter, wohlwollender Schöpfer dahinter steht oder nicht. Für Valentin ist der "Name" eines guten Schöpfers nicht in der Schöpfung vorfindbar, sondern wird *nachträglich* vom Wissen des Gnostikers der Welt, böse wie sie ist, zuerkannt.

[39] NHC I,3 (Attridge NHS 22 und 23). Der Plural αἰῶνες bezeichnet 23,1.16; 24,17; 27,7 die Empfänger der Offenbarung, also irdische Menschen, 38,35 sind wohl präexistente Menschen gemeint. Der Singular als Gottesbezeichnung wie im 5. Fragment Valentins (Clemens Alexandrinus Str. IV 89,6-90,1) auch bei Irenäus *Haer* I, 1,1 (Λέγουσιν . . . εἶναι . . . τέλειον Αἰῶνα προόντα).—Wenn man fragt, woher Valentin diese Ausdrucksweise nahm, muss man an den frühchristlichen Gottesdienst denken, z.B. OdSal 12,4: Dort gibt der Höchste "sein Wort an seine Menschen(generationen)". Die OdSal stammen ziemlich sicher aus dem ägyptischen Alexandria zu Anfang des 2. Jahrhunderts, Valentin ist mit ihnen aufgewachsen (gegen Luise Abramowski (s. Anm. 70 bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 163), die viel späteren *syrischen* Ursprung glaubt beweisen zu können).

[40] Die Schluss-Sätze erweisen das EV eindeutig als eine *Abschiedsschrift*, für die in der Antike Platos Apologie des Sokrates (17a-42a) die literarischen Maßstäbe setzte. Diese Gattung möchte der Autor erfüllen; sogar die koptische Übersetzung lässt noch die Eleganz und Sprachkunst des griechischen Originals spüren. Ich halte die Schrift für das Testament Valentins, was ich hier aber nicht ausführen kann.

"Da lehrte das heilige Pneuma sie alle, die Danksagung zu sprechen (εὐχαριστεῖν) und brachte sie zur vollkommenen Ruhe (ἀνάπαυσις). So wurden, sagen sie, die Äonen äußerlich und innerlich einander gleich: jeder wurde ein Nous, jeder ein Logos, jeder ein rechter Mensch, jeder ein Christus." (*Haer* I 2,6) Das Drama der Äonen ist das gnostische Drama der Menschen.

Valentin konnte durchaus von "Äonen im Pleroma" sprechen. Mit der obigen Interpretation des 7. Satzes wird nur bestritten, dass Valentin unter "Äonen" *undialektisch* und ausschließlich nur Pleroma-Größen versteht. Valentin ist Platoniker und setzt bei seinen Hörern die Kenntnis der doppelten Ontologie Platons voraus: Die Interpretation der Referatsätze 3 bis 6 wird zeigen, dass dort die αἰῶνες einerseits die Lebenszeit konkreter irdischer Menschen benennent, andererseits aber ihre vorweg im Pleroma bestehenden *Präexistenzen.*[41] Die himmlischen αἰῶνες können auch gut

---

[41] Tertullian, ein peinlich genauer Jurist, legt *Adv. Val.* 4,1 (Kroymann CChr.SL 2,756) großen Wert auf Differenzen zwischen Valentin und seinen Schülern. Aber erst in 4,2 belegt er nach einer wohl kalkulierten Abschweifung eine "mutatio", freilich nur eine einzige: "Bald darauf nahm Ptolomäus den gleichen (Weg). Die Äonen, die durch Namen und Abzählbarkeit als persönliche Substanzen unterschieden sind, setzte er außerhalb Gottes fest, während Valentin sie in die Fülle der Gottheit selbst gleichsam wie (lat.: *ut*!) (deren) Empfindung und Leidenschaft und Tätigkeit eingeschlossen hatte." Tertullian konzediert, dass Valentin und Ptolomäus über das Wesen der Äonen das gleiche lehren, nämlich dass sie *in personales substantias distincti* (also kurzgesagt Individuen) seien. Nur darin sieht er die mutatio, dass Valentin und Ptolomäus den Seinsort der praeexistenten Äonen verschieden angesetzt hätten. Mehr will ich an dieser Stelle zu diesem ausgeklügelten Text nicht sagen.

In seiner Spätschrift *Adversus Praxean* (*Prax.* 8 Kroymann CChr.SL 2,1167) stellt Tertullian Valentin als Theologen der "Prolationes" vor, nämlich einen, der "einen nach dem andern Äon aus dem Äon herausgeleitet habe" (*Valentinus alium atque alium Aeonem de Aeone producens*). Um sich selbst als den besseren, klareren Theologen darzustellen, führt er Valentins Lehre genauer aus und setzt dann seine eigene These dagegen, sie lautet: *Protulit enim Deus sermonem ... sicut radix fruticem et fons fluuium et sol radium.* Von Valentin referiert er: *Valentinus προβολάς suas discernit et separat ab auctore et ita longe ab eo ponit ut Aeon patrem nesciat. Denique desiderat nosse nec potest, immo et paene deuoratur et dissoluitur in reliquam substantiam.* "Valentin trennt und scheidet seine Probalas vom Urheber und setzt sie so weit von ihm ab, dass ein (jeder?) Äon den Vater nicht kennt. Auch hätte er (der Äon) ihn ja gerne erkannt, konnte es aber nicht: Fast wäre er sogar aufgefressen und aufgelöst worden in die andere (= nichtgöttliche) Substanz." Hier ist von *menschlicher* Gottesferne und Gottessuche die Rede, also von Äonen in dem Sinne, wie ich ihn für Valentin ansetze, auch wenn Tertullian dies nicht verstehen will (s. *Prax.* 3,6!) und (wenig geschickt!) innerhalb des Satzes vom Plural προβολάς in den (christologisch adaptierbaren) Singular Aeon wechselt. Warum aber die Äonen zunächst im ersten Äon waren und wieso sie nach der Trennung ihren Ursprung nicht kennen und

philosophisch δυνάμεις (wörtlich: Kräfte) genannt werden (Belege F. Sagnard *La Gnose Valentinienne* 637), denn sie sind sozusagen die Potenzen, die noch unentwickelt ("ungestaltet") im Bereich des Möglichen liegen. Von solchen Präexistenzen bzw. Potenzen zu sprechen ist in Valentins Situation platonisch-wissenschaftliche, *aufgeklärte* Ausdrucksweise.

Beobachtungen und Erläuterungen zum 3. Satz

a Ὅρους τε δύο ὑπέθετο,
b ἕνα μὲν μεταξὺ τοῦ Βυθοῦ καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ πληρώματος,
c —διορίζοντα τοὺς γεννητοὺς αἰῶνας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου πατρός—,
d ἕτερον δὲ τὸν ἀφορίζοντα αὐτῶν τὴν μητέρα ἀπὸ τοῦ πληρώματος.

Markschies teilt diesen Satz vom Vorangegangenen ab. "Als einen zweiten, eigenen Abschnitt möchte ich diesen Teil schon deswegen abtrennen, weil hier nicht mehr eine konventionelle Aionengenealogie erzählt wird . . . . . Damit liegt aber ein völlig anderes Genre als in der Pleroma-Genealogie des ersten Abschnitts vor" (Markschies (Anm. 1) 369). Das ist richtig, doch muss man diesen Satz noch sehr viel entschiedener und konsequenter von den Sätzen 1 und 2 absetzen, als Markschies es tut. Denn auch er bezieht die γεννητοὺς αἰῶνας auf die "Pleroma-Genealogie", an die der 2. Satz erinnert; damit geht auch er in die von Irenäus gestellte Falle: die ὅροι sind funktionslos, die Aussage ist unverständlich. Genau dies will Irenäus; schon seine Wahl des Verbs ὑποτίθημι suggeriert, es handle sich um ganz willkürliche Hypothesen. Irenäus will eben nicht informieren, sondern desinformieren.

Eine angemessene Übersetzung ist erst möglich, wenn man herausfindet, welches Thema der ursprüngliche Lehrsatz Valentins hatte, d.h. welche Funktionen er den ὅροι zuschrieb. Die erste Schranke zwischen der "Tiefe" und dem "Rest an Fülle" trennt[42]—so erläutert die Parenthese 3c—den ganzen Bereich des Gewordenen vom ungewordenen "Vater". Thema ist also die Beziehung geschaffener Wesen auf Gott hin. Sinnvoll sind solche Aussagen nur, wo ein bewusstes Gottesverhältnis vorliegt, also bei Menschen. Diese Überlegung ermöglicht eine prägnante Übersetzung:

---

was die "reliqua substantia" ist, die sie zu verschlingen droht, das kann nur der verstehen, der das "Evangelium Veritatis" zur Hand nimmt. Also, meine ich, kannte Tertullian das EV und Valentin als dessen Autor!

[42] Brox (Anm. 34) 207 bietet zweimal das Präteritum "trennte", zweifellos ein Übersetzungs- oder Setzfehler, der aber sehr irritiert.

a Er (= Valentin) hat auch zwei Schranken angesetzt,
b eine zwischen der "Tiefe" und dem, was an Fülle (der Pro-Existenzen) übrig bleibt,
c —sie sperrt die gewordenen Pro-Existenzen (der Menschen) vom ungewordenen Vater aus—,
d eine andere, die ihrer (der Menschen) aller Mutter von der Fülle absperrt.[43]

Valentin setzt die klassische doppelte Ontologie Platos voraus: Im Pleroma existiert zeitlos-unbeweglich, was in der Erfahrungswelt von Zeit und Vergänglichkeit bestimmt ist. Auch jeder Mensch existiert in dieser doppelten Weise: als zeitlose Pro-Existenz und als zeitliche Existenz. Valentin will über den Gottesbezug dieser beiden Existenzweisen belehren; er tut dies, indem er zwei Verben differenziert gebraucht: διορίζω heißt "eine Schranke oder Mauer aufrichten", also "unübersteigbar aussperren", ἀφορίζω aber heißt "abgrenzen", "ein Grundstück abstecken", also nur "trennen". Die beiden ὅροι haben unterschiedliche Funktionen: Die erste Schranke zwischen anfangslosem "Vater" und den geschaffenen Pro-Existenzen trennt schlechthin unerbittlich,[44] nur "Schweigen" anerkennt sie. Die zweite Schranke trennt weniger streng, "ihrer (der Menschen) aller Mutter", also die Menschheit ist durch eine weniger abschließende Schranke vom Pleroma getrennt. Die zweite Schranke bewahrt die Pro-Existenzen in der Fülle,[45]

---

[43] Der letzte Satz weckt Argwohn; in Opposition zum "ungewordenen Vater" erwartet man "ihrer aller Mutter" als eine göttliche Instanz, dann wäre zu korrigieren: "die ihrer aller Mutter zusammen mit der Fülle (nach außen) abgrenzt" entsprechend Irenäus *Haer* I 2,4: "Sie (die Sophia) ist im Pleroma verblieben, doch wurde ihre Enthymesis (ihr allzumenschliches Begehren) zusammen mit der Leidenschaft durch den Horos abgetrennt (ἀφορισθῆναι) . . . ." Ich bleibe aber beim Text, wie Irenäus ihn bietet, und stimme mit Markschies (Anm. 1) 372 überein, dass in diesem Zusammenhang nur von einer, nämlich irdischen Mutter die Rede ist.

[44] Wenn Valentin so lehrte, kann das sogn. Fragment 8 (Hippolyt *Haer* VI 37,7) nicht von ihm stammen, denn dieses schlichte Gedichtchen verwendet das Bild der "Goldenen Kette", um die göttliche "Tiefe" *bruchlos* mit der Erscheinungswelt zu verbinden. Ein durch einen "Horos" abgeriegelter "Bythos" passt dazu nicht, das sieht auch Markschies (Anm. 1) 376 ad 1. Markschies entscheidet sich jedoch dafür, Frag. 8 Valentin zuzuschreiben, ihm aber die Lehre vom doppelten Horos abzusprechen. Eine bruchlose Kontinuität vom göttlichen Ursprung bis hin zu den Einzelerscheinungen ist jedoch stoisch-pantheistische Theologie; kein Gnostiker lehrte so. Markschies konzediert 377: "Ob nun erst Ptolomäus . . . oder schon dieser selbst (= Valentin) den Widerspruch zwischen dem bruchlosen harmonischen Weltaufbau (Frgm. 8) und der Verfallenheit dieser Welt (Frgm. 2/4) durch den Fall der Sophia erklärte, wissen wir nicht".

[45] Wohl nicht von Valentin, sondern aus seiner Schule stammt ein Lehrsatz, den man aus Irenäus *Haer* I 2,5 (SC 264,46) gewinnen kann: τὸ μὲν αἴτιον τῆς διαμονῆς τῶν

während die irdischen Existenzen ausgesperrt sind. Aber diese Schranke gilt als nicht so unüberwindbar wie die erste: da ist Kennen(lernen) und Heimkehr möglich.

Die Lehre von den beiden ὅροι kann mit gutem Grund Valentin zugesprochen werden. Er sicherte damit einerseits die schlechthinnige Transzendenz des fremden, unbekannten Gottes und andererseits die Möglichkeit der *Erinnerung*, wodurch schon in diesem Leben ausreichende, nämlich das Handeln bestimmende Einsicht vom Göttlichen zu gewinnen ist: "Es wirkt nämlich gerade das, was an Gott unsichtbar ist, (mit dem Gottesverständnis des Gnostikers) dahin zusammen, dass (ihm) das Geschaffene vertrauenswürdig ist."[46] Der Gnostiker versteht *und akzeptiert* seine Trennung vom göttlichen Bereich, doch weiß er, dass die zweite Absperrung aufhebbar ist und durch die γνῶσις schon in diesem Leben *in gewisser Weise aufgehoben wird*. Zugleich ist deutlich, dass Irenäus zwar wörtlich referiert, beim Leser aber nicht Verständnis, sondern Kopfschütteln erreichen will.

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 4. Satz

a Καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν δὲ οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ πληρώματι αἰώνων προβεβλῆσθαι,
Christus jedoch sei nicht von den (Pro-Existenzen) in der Fülle hervorgesprossen,

b ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἔξω γενομένης κατὰ τὴν μνήμην τῶν κρειττόνων ἀποκεκυῆσθαι μετὰ σκιᾶς τινος·
sondern er sei von der Mutter, die außerhalb (des göttlichen Bereichs) war, gemäß ihrer in einem Schatten liegenden Erinnerung an das Tüchtigere geboren worden;

c καὶ τοῦτον μέν, ἅτε ἄρρενα ὑπάρχοντα, ἀποκόψαντα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν σκιὰν
doch weil ihm eine mannhafte Kraft zu eigen war, sei er aus diesem Schatten völlig herausgekommen (lit: habe ihn von sich abgeschnitten)

d ἀναδραμεῖν εἰς τὸ πλήρωμα.
und im Wettkampf hinaufgelaufen bis in die Fülle.

Abrupt wechselt das Thema, man kann höchstens von einem Stichwortanschluss sub voce "Aion/Pleroma" sprechen. Thema ist nun die Christologie.

αἰώνων (Irenäus: τῆς αἰωνίου διαμονῆς τοῖς ὅλοις) τὸ ἀκατάληπτον ὑπάρχειν τοῦ πατρός· τῆς δὲ γενέσεως καὶ μορφώσεως τὸ καταληπτὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃ δὴ υἱός ἐστιν. Ich übersetze: Der Grund, dass die Pro-Existenzen unwandelbar feststehen, liege im Unfasslichen des Vaters (d.i. seiner eigentlichen Göttlichkeit), der Grund aber, dass sie geboren werden und sichtbare Gestalt annehmen, im Fassbaren, das ist der Sohn.

[46] Dies ist der letzte Satz des 5. Fragments (Clemens Alex. Str. IV 90,1): συνεργεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀόρατον εἰς πίστιν τοῦ πεπλασμένου. Zur Interpretation dieses Fragments und seiner gut belegten Wirkungsgeschichte s. Paul Schüngel, Gnostische Gotteslehren, *VigChr* 53 (1999) 361-394, hier ab 370.

Terminologisch wird dem Kolosserbrief widersprochen; Sätze wie "Denn Gott wollte mit seiner ganzen Fülle (πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα) in ihm wohnen" (Kol 1,19) und "Denn in ihm allein wohnt wirklich und leibhaftig die ganze Fülle der Gottheit (πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος)" (Kol 2,9) werden abgewiesen. Sachlich wird die kirchliche Vorstellung von der Gottgleichheit des Christus[47] bestritten und eine Gegenlehre entwickelt: Er sei von der "Mutter", die "außerhalb" war, "geboren" worden. Ein klarer Gegensatz zur abgewiesenen These von der Herkunft aus Gott selbst[48] ist dies aber nur, wenn die Mutter hier wie im vorangehenden Satz das Menschengeschlecht ist. Die These der Quelle ist: Jesus wurde geboren als ein Mensch wie alle Menschen. Die "nach außen geratene Mutter" (das Menschengeschlecht bzw. die ihm eigentümliche Sophia) konnte ihm wie allen Menschen nur eine gewisse *Erinnerung*[49] mitgeben an das im Pleroma Geschaute. Diese Erinnerung an das Göttliche heißt "das Tüchtigere",[50] weil es zum tüch-

---

[47] In diesem Anliegen sind sich die Valentinianer einig, weil sie in der (erst viel später definierten!) kirchlichen Lehre eine Aufgabe der Einheit und Einzigkeit Gottes sehen. Ihre Formulierungen dazu waren freilich unterschiedlich. "Während die orientalische Schule Christus außerhalb des Pleromas geboren sein ließ, begibt er sich nach der Dogmatik der italischen Schule nur kurz zur Ausgestaltung der Achamoth aus der Welt der Aionen, in die er von Anfang an gehört." (Markschies (Anm. 1) 372). In der Sache sehe ich hier keine Differenzen—die Valentinianer sind doch keine Konzils-Juristen.

[48] Die Formulierung οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ πληρώματι αἰώνων muss eine Verfälschung sein: wie jeder Mensch hatte auch Jesus eine Praeexistenz im Pleroma. In der räumlichen Vorstellung bleibend hatte die Quelle wohl ἐκ μεσότητος (τῶν) αἰώνων bzw. ἐκ τοῦ ἐντὸς πλερώματος (s. Anm. 61!) oder eine ähnliche Formulierung.

[49] Hinter dieser Formulierung steht die platonische Seelenlehre und Erkenntnistheorie. Vergl. hierzu Winrich A. Löhr, Karpokratianisches *VigChr* 49 (1995) 23-48, besonders 24-26. Nach Irenäus *Haer* I 25,1 lehrte Karpokrates, "daß Jesus von Josef gezeugt und den Menschen gleich war, den anderen aber das voraus hatte, daß seine Seele rein und stark war, so daß sie sich an die Dinge erinnerte, die sie bei ihrem Umlauf beim ungezeugten Vater gesehen hatte, und deshalb wurde ihr von ihm eine Kraft hinabgeschickt, damit sie den Weltschöpfern entkommen konnte." In 25,2 wird die Lebensweise derer, die sich erinnern, geschildert: "Jede Seele, die es fertigbringt, so wie Jesu Seele die weltschöpferischen Archonten zu verachten, empfängt ganz genauso eine Kraft, um das gleiche zu tun." (Übersetzung Brox (Anm. 34) 307) Die "mundi fabricatores archontes" sind als die Mächte zu verstehen, die einen entfremdenden Zwang auf die irdischen Menschen ausüben, konkret vor allem das römische imperium. Die Herrschaft der römischen Kaiser erschafft einerseits erst eine von Menschen bewohnbare Welt, andererseits ist sie ein Moloch, der das Göttlich-Weltunabhängige, das keimhaft in jedem Menschen steckt, auffressen will. Dagegen wehrt sich der Gnostiker, entsprechend rigoros ist seine Macht- und Staatskritik, die er freilich klug verschlüsseln muss.

[50] Die hier thematisierte Anthropologie stimmt völlig mit dem 1. Fragment Valentins

tigen Leben befähigt, diese Erinnerung ist jedoch dunkel, "überschattet". Von dieser irdischen Mutter geboren ist auch Jesus einer, der in Irrtum, Wahn und eingebildetem Wissen befangen ist und nur mühsam aus der "Erinnerung an das Tüchtigere" schöpfen kann. Sehr skeptisch wird hier über das Menschsein gelehrt; dies ist die elende Situation aller Menschen, auch Jesu.

Jesus—Valentin sprach nicht von Christus, sondern vom galiläischen Jesus, der in viele Widerstände und Kämpfe verwickelt war!—habe jedoch seine Geburts-Situation überwunden, er habe den Schatten, der sein Bewusstsein verdunkelte, "von sich abgetrennt", d.h. er sei aus diesem Schatten herausgetreten. Das war ihm möglich, weil er ἄρρην war. Das ist nicht als Bezeichnung seines biologischen Geschlechts gemeint, sondern als menschlich-ethische Qualifikation: er war mannhaft-tüchtig. Deshalb war er fähig, das mitgebrachte bzw. erinnerte Göttliche in sich so auszubauen, dass es ihn bestimmte und als weltüberlegene Vollmacht tätig war. Das aber ist genau die soteriologische Vorstellung Valentins:

> Indem er alles ertrug, war er seiner selbst mächtig (ἐγκρατής):
> Jesus erarbeitete Weltüberlegenheit (wörtlich: Gotthaftigkeit).[51]
> Kernsatz des Fragments 3: Clemens von Alexandrien Str. III 59,3

Die These "Weil ihm eine mannhafte Tüchtigkeit zu eigen war, ist er aus diesem Schatten völlig herausgetreten und im Wettkampf hinaufgelaufen bis in die Fülle" entwickelt die gleiche Lehre über Jesus wie das 3. Fragment, sie ist mit Sicherheit Valentin zuzuschreiben. Auch ist klar,

---

(Clemens Alex. *Str.* II 36,2-4) überein. Dort heißt die göttliche Mitgift μείζονα = Größeres und σπέρμα δεδωκότα τῆς ἄνοθεν οὐσίας (der vom oberen Reichtum gegebene Keimling). Ihre ursprüngliche Befähigung können die Menschen aber nicht nutzen, weil die "Engel" (die biologischen und kulturellen Kräfte, die irdisch-bedingte Menschen entstehen lassen) ihr eigenes Werk "verpfuscht" haben. Ich verstehe den Schluss von Fragment 1 so: "Denn Adam, der auf Rechnung (εἰς ὄνομα) des (von ihm zu bewährenden) Menschseins gebildet wurde, setzte (die weltimmanenten Kräfte) in Furcht vor dem vorausexistierenden Menschen (προῶν ἄνθρωπος), da dieser ja (von Gott) in ihn hineingesetzt worden war. Daraufhin erschraken diese (Kräfte) und verdarben augenblicklich ihr Erzeugnis (ἔργον)". Zum "Menschen, der hineingesetzt wurde" bzw. "den wir in uns tragen" s. Anm. 61 und 62!

[51] Das Drei-Worte-Sätzchen θεότητα Ἰησοῦς εἰργάζετο formuliert polemisch, denn ἐργάζω bezeichnet mühevolle, alle Kräfte anspannende Arbeit. θεότης ist ein Kunstwort, es kommt im Neuen Testaments nur Kol 2,9 vor und steht hier ohne Artikel. Diskussion der Konjekturvorschläge bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 86, der Übersetzungsmöglichkeiten 91-97. Aber hier ist keine Konjektur nötig, der Text ist in dieser provozierenden Härte gewollt.—Zum Verständnis dieses schwierigen Fragments s. unten Anm. 60 und 61.

warum Jesus als Athlet geschildert ist: das Leben und Lehren Jesu war in der Sicht Valentins ein harter, alle Kräfte fordernder Athletenkampf. Das Leben Jesu war von außen gesehen eine Kette von vergeblichen Anstrengungen und zahllosen Enttäuschungen, es endete im völligen Scheitern; dennoch war es für Valentin das größtmögliche Konkretwerden eines der Welt überlegenen Menschen. "Pleroma" scheint mir daher *in diesem Satzgefüge* einerseits die "Fülle" zu benennen, die einer unter den Bedingungen des irdischen Lebens in seinem Menschsein erreichen kann, andererseits die "Fülle", die auch Jesus im göttlichen Bereich wiederfindet. Ganz wie der 4. Evangelist mit seinem τετέλεσται (Joh 19,30) denkt Valentin eine "Himmelfahrt vom Kreuz aus": das Zeugnis gebende Leben Jesu hatte seinen Höhepunkt, seine "Fülle" im Kreuz, und von dort mündete Jesus in die himmlische "Fülle".

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 5. Satz

a Τὴν δὲ μητέρα ὑπολειφθεῖσαν μετὰ τῆς σκιᾶς κεκενωμένην τε τῆς πνευματικῆς ὑποστάσεως
Weil die Mutter, die unter dem Schatten geblieben war, ganz entleert war von dem (= ihrem) pneumatischen Vorrat,

b ἕτερον υἱὸν προενέγκασθαι, καὶ τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν Δημιουργόν, ὃν καὶ Παντοκρατόρα λέγει τῶν ὑποκειμένων.
habe sie (nur noch) einen andersartigen Sohn herausgepresst, und das sei der Demiurg, den er (= Valentin) auch Allherrscher nennt über alle, die sich (ihm) unterstellen.

c Συμπροβεβλῆσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἀριστερὸν ἄρχοντα ἐδογμάτισεν . . . . . .
Mit diesem zusammen sei auch ein "linker Herrscher" hervorgesprossen, wie er (= Valentin) zusammen mit denen lehrt, die fälschlicherweise Gnostiker heißen und über die wir (= Irenäus) später noch mehr sprechen wollen.

Satz 5 schließt nahtlos an den vorangehenden Doppelsatz an, er muss also wohl auch als These Valentins gelten. Irenäus konnte diese These wörtlich referieren, weil sie für ihn puren Unsinn enthielt: die Mutter, die Jesus geboren hat, hat anschließend[52] den Weltschöpfer geboren und den Teufel gleich dazu! Solchen Unsinn kann man ja nicht einmal im Traum erfinden, aber Valentin bietet ihn!

Dass Irenäus hier groben Unsinn liest, liegt zunächst an der kulturellen Unbedarftheit, besser *Kulturfeindschaft*, die er bei seinen Lesern voraussetzt.

---

[52] Diese Zeitstufung steht nicht im Text. Irenäus und auch ein heutiger Leser trägt sie fraglos ein. Aber Valentin kümmert sich hier nicht um einen geschichtlichen Ablauf, sondern treibt theologische Phänomenologie oder Ontologie, und zwar *platonisch-zeitlos*: für Valentin und seine Hörer ist dies die angemessene Rede- und Denkweise.

Valentin nimmt hier wie im Fragment 2 (Clemens Alex. Str. II 36,2-4) das damalige Verständnis der *Götterbilder* auf. Wenn die "Mutter" wie im vorigen Satz das Menschengeschlecht ist, so ist nach diesem Verständnis klar: diese Mutter hat die Götter*bilder* hervorgebracht, denn die Völker aller Zeiten haben je ihre eigenen Götterbilder, Götterdichtungen und -traditionen. Das lernte man bei Homer und Hesiod, das war Allgemeinbildung. Auch unterschied jeder, der in seiner Stadt herumging, sehr genau die jeweiligen Götterdarstellungen (im gallischen, römischen, griechischen, ägyptischen, babylonischen und sogar indischen Stil!) von dem, was da gemeint war. Irenäus aber und seine Leser nehmen die Darstellung für die Sache und ein Wort[53] wie "Demiurg" als die Sache selbst. Dann kommt natürlich grober Unsinn heraus, aber das ist nicht Valentins Schuld.

Um zu verstehen, was Valentin sagen will, ist es notwendig, sich den Sitz im Leben dieser Darlegung klarzumachen. Valentin hielt öffentlichen Unterricht, für den er Honorar forderte. Ein kluger Lehrer achtet darauf, dass es in der Schulstunde hin und wieder auch etwas zu lachen oder wenigstens zu schmunzeln gibt. Hier liefert Valentin den Beweis, dass er ein solcher Lehrer war: er malt ein *Bild*, bei dem der Verständige sich amüsiert. Valentin malt aus, dass die "Mutter" (das Menschengeschlecht), die Jesus geboren und all ihre Kraft in ihn investiert hat, im übrigen so völlig ausgepumpt und schlapp ist, dass sie nur "Nullen" produzieren kann. Diese "Nullen" haben zu geringe Erinnerung an die himmlische Weisheit und machen sich daher auf eigene Faust Gottesvorstellungen, nämlich die vom "Weltbaumeister" (Δημιουργός) und "Alles-was-ist-Beherrscher". Das sind bei Valentin Spottnamen, auch wenn sie eine ehrwürdige Tradition haben. Denn die Menschen, die den einen Unsagbaren so benennen, verehren im Grunde einen Machthaber, ja die Macht selbst; Jesus aber und jeder Gnostiker, der von ihm lernt, "erarbeitet Weltüberlegenheit",[54] das

---

[53] Zur (Selbst-)Täuschung durch die "Wörter" siehe EvPhil 11 (NHC II,3 53,23-35 Layton NHS 20 und 21). Nur die beiden Lesungsvorschläge Sevrins und Laytons erbringen einen sinnvollen Text, s. dazu Hans-Martin Schenke, *Das Philippus-Evangelium*, Berlin 1997 (TU 143) 182-186; Schenke resümiert 185: "Die ὀνόματα des Bekenntnisses können nicht das νοεῖσθαι der von ihnen gemeinten ἑστῶτα bewirken, aber wohl ein δεικνύναι derselben."—Vergl. auch NHC I,5 54,2-23 (Attridge NHS 22 und 23).

[54] Fragment 3, s. dazu Anm. 51.—Wenn durch die Ethik Jesu Situationsüberlegenheit, wenn auch nur je und je, tatsächlich erreicht wird, dann kennt jeder, der in dieser Erfahrung steht, den "Vater" Jesu als einen Gott, der den Vorstellungen vom "Allmächtigen" konträr ist. Von daher erklärt sich die "Protestexegese" (K. Rudolph) gegen Ex 20,5 ("denn ich, der Herr, dein Gott, bin ein eifersüchtiger Gott") und noch mehr gegen

ist auch Überlegenheit in Bezug auf die Macht und ihre Träger, die "Archonten" (s. Anm. 49). Ohne eingeübte Weltüberlegenheit, also ohne γνῶσις fürchtet jeder die vielen Machthaber der politischen Welt, vor allem aber: er kennt nur den als Über-Machthaber projezierten Gott[55] und fürchtet ihn. Das letztere ist Valentin besonders wichtig. Denn Gott als "Alles-was-ist-Beherrscher" zu verstehen und—was dem Ethiker Valentin noch wichtiger ist—sich ihm zu unterwerfen (5b), das hat nach seiner Ansicht eine Kehrseite: den Teufelsglauben. Angesichts des oft schlimmen Weltlaufs und *der alltäglichen widrigen Erfahrungen* geht die Verehrung des "Allmächtigen" meist zusammen mit der Vorstellung eines "Quertreibers", eines "διάβολος" (einer, der alle und alles gegeneinander aufbringt), eines "linken Fürsten" (einer, der nach links dreht, was rechts gehen sollte). Es verbindet sich die *Vorstellung* vom "allmächtigen Gott" geradezu zwangsläufig mit der *Vorstellung* eines "Teufels", der alles verwirrt und schiefgehen lässt: Valentin zeigt dies auf und illustriert es mit drastischem Humor als eine Zwillingsgeburt![56]

Auch der Gnostiker hat nicht Gott, sondern eine Vorstellung von Gott. Wie kommen Menschen zum Verständnis des ihnen völlig fremden, unbekannten Gottes? Und wieso ist die gnostische Gottesvorstellung überlegen? Valentin lehrt dies im Fragment 2 (Clemens von Alexandrien *Str* II 114,3-6), und zwar zunächst dogmatisch. Es ist die Jesusoffenbarung und nur die Jesusoffenbarung,[57] die zum Verständnis dieses anderen Gottes führt:

Jes 45,5 (bzw. 46,9), wo es in politisch-militärischem Zusammenhang heißt "Ich bin der Herr, und sonst niemand; außer mir gibt es keinen Gott." Hartwig Thyen (RAC 17,196) stellt fest, dass von den Gnostikern kein Bibeltext "so häufig und stets in jedem Sinne negativ beschworen (wird)" wie dieser; RAC 17,197f führt Thyen aus 9 Nag-Hammadi-Schriften 13 Stellen auf. Locus classicus ist Iren. *Haer* I 30,6: "Dann frohlockte Jaldabaoth, brüstete sich mit allem, was sich unter ihm befand, und sprach: "Ich bin Vater und Gott, und über mir ist niemand". Das hörte aber die Mutter, widersprach ihm und rief: "Lüg nicht, Jaldabaoth, denn über dir ist der Vater aller, der Erste Anthropos, und der Anthropos, der Sohn des Menschen!" (Übers. Brox (Anm. 34) 337).

[55] Man möge mir nicht mit dem Einwand kommen, ich argumentiere völlig ahistorisch, nämlich mit Theologenthesen des 19. Jahrhunderts. Erstens haben schon die frühen Sophisten die menschlichen Gottesvorstellungen als Projektionen kritisiert, zweitens hat die gesamte hellenistische Pädagogik dies übernommen, und drittens lässt sich zeigen, dass Valentin den "Unsichtbaren", der zugleich der schlechthin "Unnennbare" ist, sorgfältig unterschieden hat von den Vorstellungen, die die Menschen sich machen (und machen müssen).

[56] Bei den Schülern Valentins wurde das humorige Bild des Meisters zur Selbstverständlichkeit, auf die man ohne Erklärung anspielen kann, so im Brief des *Ptolomäus an Flora* 7,9 (Quispel SC 24bis 72f).

[57] Barbara Aland zum Fragments 13 des Valentinschülers Herakleon: "Die Viehverkäufer

> Einer nur ist gut! Sein offenes Sprechen—nämlich durch den Sohn—ist sein öffentliches Erscheinen.

Aber eine Lehre führt niemals zu einem qualitativ überlegenen Gottesverständnis, mit Worten allein ist da nichts zu erreichen. Valentin wechselt darum von der dogmatischen Lehre in den psychologisch-pragmatischen Bereich: Das gnostische Verständnis Gottes stammt nicht aus einer Gottes*lehre* (oder gar Gottesspekulation), sondern aus (qualitativ anderer) Gottes*erfahrung*. Valentin beschreibt *phänomenologisch* die Psyche der Menschen. Er schildert in einem Vergleich des Menschenherzen mit einer verkommenen Herberge das alltägliche Selbst-Erleben der Menschen: die verschiedenen Antriebe und Wertvorstellungen in einem Menschen (seine πνεύματα) stehen so im Streit miteinander, dass sie ihr eigenes "Haus" verkennen und es ruinieren. Menschen mit solchen Herzen fehlt Selbst-Erkenntnis und πρόνοια, d.h. sie haben keinen ihr Handeln lenkenden Vorausblick. Ein solches "unreines Herz", das sich selbst verkennt, wird "rein" nicht durch Worte und Belehrung, sondern duch ein Geschehen. Der Schluss von Fragment 2 formuliert:

> Wenn aber der Vater, der allein gut ist, es (das Herz) wie ein Arzt besucht, wird es geheilt und mit Licht durchstrahlt. Auf diese Weise wird derjenige (mit gutem Grund) selig gepriesen, der ein derartiges Herz hat: Er wird Gott schauen.[58]

Der "einzige, der gut ist", ist auch "der allein gute Vater", seine Tätigkeit bezeichnet das Verb ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. Ich verstehe es als Fachwort der Ärzte,[59] es bedeutet "ärztlich visitieren". Valentin erwartet keinen wunderhaften Vorgang, der sozusagen mit einem Schlag heilt und alle Dämonen ver-

---

und Geldwechsler, die in das ἱερόν eingedrungen sind, symbolisieren dann die Situation dieses Menschen in der Welt—d.h. grundsätzlich die jedes Menschen. Er hielt sein ἱερόν nicht rein, sondern ließ Fremde (207,5) in es eindringen, ließ also seine Gabe verkümmern. Jesus—und es ist zu betonen, erst Jesus und nur Jesus—treibt die Fremden heraus. . . . . Durch die Kraft von Kreuz und Geist wird daher "die Gemeinde bereitet", wird aus der Höhle von Räubern und Händlern, die der Mensch vor Christus darstellt, das Haus des Vaters (207,20ff). Die Parallele zu Valentin, der das Herz mit einer von üblen Rauf- und Trunkenbolden besudelten Herberge verglich, ist deutlich (Frg. 2). Hier wie dort kommt die Rettung allein von dem Soter (bzw. dem Vater), ohne den das Herz nichts als eine wüste Höhle bleiben müßte." (in: M. Krause, *Gnosis und Gnostizismus* (NHS 8), 161.)

[58] Valentins 2. Fragment ist eine Kommentierung, ja Korrektur des Matthäusverses, vergl. Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures* 245 Anm. 1: "Thus the passage is an interpretation of Mt 5:8, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

[59] Die vielen anderen Möglichkeiten s. Markschies (Anm. 1) 77f.

treibt. Er setzt vielmehr auf das *Einüben* der Weisung Jesu und ein allmähliches Starkwerden in ihr so wie die antiken Ärzte auf Leibesübungen und Diäthalten setzten. Wer die Lehren Jesu (und die Vorträge Valentins!) aufmerksam hört, das Gehörte beherzigt und nicht nach dem Splitter im Auge des Nächsten, sondern nach dem Balken im eigenen Auge sucht und daran arbeitet, ihn *bei sich* herauszuziehen (Mt 7,35 Lk 6,41f EvThom 10), der findet zur πρόνοια, die ihn heilt. Ein solcher wird mit "Licht", nämlich heilender Selbsterfahrung durchstrahlt; seine Antriebe werden aus einem Knäuel miteinander kämpfender Bestien zu einem Team,[60] das miteinander kooperiert. Die Gotteserkenntnis vom "allein guten Vater" ist nur dann anderer Gotteserkenntnis überlegen, wenn sie zur Integration der inneren Antriebe[61] führt und auf dieser Basis situationsüberlegen initiativ werden lässt; sie braucht *diese Bewährung*[62] *und Bewahrheitung*. Denn diese Erkenntnis Gottes ist wesentlich eine Bevollmächtigung, sie ist die Entdeckung der

---

[60] Dieses Bild stammt von Plato (Rep IX 588b-589b). Dort werden ein großes, sehr wildes, manchmal auch zahmes Tier, das seine vielen Köpfe beliebig wechseln kann, ein kleinerer Löwe und ein Menschlein, *in eins zusammengefasst*, als *Modell* der menschlichen Seele angesetzt. Dieses Gleichnis war bei den Gnostikern sehr beliebt: EvThom 7 spielt darauf an, und NHC VI,5 ist eine zur admonitio gewandelte Fassung, leider in jämmerlicher Übersetzung. Gegen Markschies (Anm. 1) 56 Anm. 15 letzter Satz bin ich der Ansicht, dass Valentin sehr wohl dieses Bild Platos kennt und auch seine Klienten es kennen.

[61] Hippolyts Valentinreferat *Haer* X 13 ist von problematischem Wert. Der Anfang ist zweifellos von Irenäus *Haer* I 11,1 abhängig, nicht aber der soteriologische Teil: Τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἐκτὸς πληρώματος κατεληλυθέναι ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ ἀποπλανηθέντος πνεύματος, ὃ κατοικεῖ <ἐν τῷ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ>, ὃν σωζόμενόν φησι τούτου χάριν τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος. τὴν δὲ σάρκα μὴ σῴζεσθαι θέλει, <δερμάτινον χιτῶνα> ἀποκαλῶν καὶ <ἄνθρωπον φθειρόμενον> (Marcovich PTS 25 391,1-5). Ich übersetze: Christus sei aus dem Inneren der Fülle entlassen worden (pass. div!), um das in (Selbst-)Täuschung geratene Pneuma zu retten. Dieses wohnt (als Fremdling?) "in dem Menschen, den wir in uns tragen", auch werde dieser, so lehrt er, um des darin Wohnenden willen gerettet. Das Fleisch will er nicht gerettet werden lassen, er nennt es "aus Fell gefertigten Leibrock" und "verpfuschten Menschen".—Die Redeweise ἐν τῷ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ stammt aus dem in der vorigen Anmerkung genannten Gleichnis Platos; hier ist Platos dreidimensionale (nicht dreifach gestufte!) Seelenlehre übernommen mit der entscheidenden Korrektur einer vierten, überirdischen Instanz (s. Anm. 50!). Diese Thesen sind valentinisch, weil der ἄνθρωπος φθειρόμενος dem Satz im 1. Fragment entspricht, dass die Engel ταχὺ τὸ ἔργον ἠφάνισαν. Auch die πλάνη-Vorstellung ist valentinisch.

[62] Das meinten jene Valentinianer, von denen Irenäus—verleumderisch das Thema ins Sexuelle verschiebend—berichtet: "Man kann nach ihrer Meinung nur so gerettet werden, daß man alles durchmacht, wie auch Karpokrates das vertreten hat." (*Haer* I 31,2, vergl. 25,4: "Die Seelen müssen im Zuge ihrer Wanderung in Leiber jedes Leben und jedes Tun durchmachen—. . . .—, so daß nach Aussage ihrer Schriften ihren Seelen

"Meerestiefe an Vollmacht",[63] die das Leben in eine neue Qualität hebt. Davon wissen all diejenigen, die nur den "Alles-was-ist-Beherrscher" und Weltbaumeister kennen, nichts; ihre Gotteserkenntnis ist Unwissen und "eine Frucht des Mangels" (Irenäus *Haer* I 17,2 und 19,1).

Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Erläuterungen zum 6. Satz

Καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν
a ποτὲ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ συσταλέντος ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῶν, συναναχυθέντος τοῖς ὅλοις προβηβλῆσθαί φησι, τουτέστιν τοῦ Θελητοῦ,
b ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναδραμόντος εἰς τὸ πλήρωμα, τουτέστιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ,
c ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.

Dieser Text ist—zumindest in seinem ersten Teil—unsinniger Schwulst, und darum ergibt eine Übersetzung nur Unsinn. Es ist aber zu erkennen, dass Irenäus die προβηβλῆσθαι ἀπό-Konstruktion einsetzt, um drei Aussagen über Jesus zusammenzuzwingen. Wenn man diese zusammenzwingende Konstruktion streicht, ergibt sich folgender klarer Sinn:

Und von dem bekannten Jesus sagt Valentin
(a) an einer Stelle: Er ist von der Mutter (= dem Menschengeschlecht/der irdischen Σοφία) her klein und (seinem Schicksal nach) mit all den anderen (Menschen) zusammengeflossen, daher ist er der "Erwünschte",
(b) an anderer Stelle: Er ist in die Fülle hinaufgelaufen, daher ist er der "Gesalbte",
(c) und an einer dritten Stelle: Aus ihm[64] sind "Mensch" und "Kirche" entsprossen.

---

beim Auszug (aus dem Leib) absolut nichts mehr fehlt, nachdem sie das Leben in jeder Hinsicht durchgemacht haben." (Übersetzung Brox (Anm. 34) 353 und 311).

[63] Porphyrius, *Abst.* I 42,2/3, bei Markschies (Anm. 1) 411-413: ὅπου δὲ βυθὸς ἐξουσίας, πάντα δέχονται καὶ οὐδενὸς μιαίνονται. Dies ist die Pointe eines tiefsinnigen, von Porphyrius anonym überlieferten und vehement abgelehnten Vergleichs der Fähigkeit des Weltmeers und der Menschen, Schlimmes zu ertragen und Übel zu "verdauen". Dieser Vergleich ist ebenso wie Valentins 3. Fragment als *Allegorie* ausgeführt, in der "essen" und "verdauen" das Bewältigen der Lebensschwierigkeiten meinen. Die Allegorie ist möglich, weil die Sprachen (die griechische ebenso wie die modernen europäischen) die Metaphern kennen, dass jemand an schlimmen Erfahrungen "zu kauen hat" oder "sie erst verdauen muss". Ich übersetze das 3. Fragment erläuternd: "Indem er alles ertrug, war er seiner selbst mächtig: Jesus erarbeitete (so seine) Weltüberlegenheit/Gotthaftigkeit. So groß war in ihm die Kraft seiner Selbstbestimmung (ἐγκρατεία ist hier nicht die christliche Enthaltsamkeit!), dass die "Nahrung" in ihm nicht aufgelöst wurde (und dadurch ernährend seine Existenz bestimmte). Er trug nämlich das Aufgelöstwerden (τὸ φθείρεσθαι: die Entfremdung vom Existenzkern) in gar keiner Weise in sich." Vorausgesetzt ist wieder die Anthropologie vom ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος und dem darin wohnenden unweltlichen Pneuma (s. Anm. 60 und 61).

[64] Aus dieser These hat Irenäus das προβηβλῆσθαι ἀπό, das er auch den beiden ande-

Irenäus möchte im 6. Satz belegen, dass Valentin drei verschiedene, sich widersprechende Definitionen über Jesus vorgetragen habe. Nun ist aber These (c) nichts als eine (wohl von Irenäus gebildete) Variation von Teilsatz (e) im 1. Satz des Irenäus-Referats, These (b) hat Irenäus aus dem 4. Satz (d) des Referats übernommen, und These (a) ist ein Topos, ein Allerweltssatz innerhalb des Christentums. Auf keinen Fall widersprechen sich diese Sätze, auch wenn Irenäus das möchte. Dazu nennt Irenäus Titel Jesu,[65] um noch mehr Verwirrung zu schaffen. Hier hat sich Irenäus sein Polemikerhandwerk zu leicht gemacht:[66] er konstruiert einen Rätseltext und behauptet darin Widersprüche, die es bei Valentin gar nicht gibt.

Erläuterungen zum 8. Satz

Nach dem Referat über Valentins Lehre vom Heiligen Geist schließt Irenäus mit dem Sätzchen Ταῦτα μὲν ἐκεῖνος, das nur lateinisch als "Haec autem ille" überliefert ist. Sprachlich ist dies eine Ellipse: der Name Valentins wird vorsätzlich ausgelassen. Dies und die Wahl der beiden Demonstrativa sind Zeichen äußerster Verachtung. Die Formel stammt aus der Gerichtsrede; man schloss mit ihr ein Plädoyer, das eine gegnerische Aussage desavouieren sollte. Genau dies ist hier die Absicht des Referenten: In der Einleitung ruft Irenäus den Leser als Richter auf, der entscheiden soll, was von diesem Valentin zu halten ist. Als Leser und Richter setzt er einen Kirchenchristen ein, der sich an das Elementarste hält, das er kennt: an die trinitarische (Tauf-)Formel vom Vater, Sohn und Heiligen Geist. Danach hat Irenäus sein Referat aufgebaut. Er bietet als Valentins Lehre vom Vater die wunderliche Darlegung einer Äonen-Genealogie, als Valentins Lehre vom Sohn ganz unverständliche und unsinnige Einzelstücke, zuletzt eine kurze, nur mit einem Wort verfälschte Lehre vom Heiligen Geist, die aber

---

ren Sätzen aufgezwingt. Andererseits hat er hier Subjekt und Objekt vertauscht, um Unsinn zu erzeugen; ich mache diese Vertauschung rückgängig.

[65] Den Christustitel hat Valentin wohl nicht verwendet, beim Titel Theletos ("Der von Gott erwünschte Mensch") mag das anders sein, ich weiß es nicht.

[66] Markschies (Anm. 1) 375: "Irenäus hat seinem Leser damit nicht nur gezeigt, daß zwei oder drei Valentinianer nicht dasselbe lehren, sondern daß *ein* Valentinianer, wenn er lehrt, zwei- oder dreimal nicht dasselbe lehrt. Damit löst er am Ende seines Paragraphen die Ankündigung des Beginns so überdeutlich ein, daß ihm der heutige kritische Leser die Argumentation kaum noch abnimmt."—Irenäus schreibt nicht für kritische Leser, weder für damalige noch für heutige, sondern er wendet sich ausschließlich an "Insider", die Bestärkung dafür wollen, dass sie ganze Wahrheit besitzen. Literatursoziologisch sind diese Bücher Agitation, sie dienen dem Bischof der bischöflichen Machtsicherung.

im von Irenäus gebotenem Kontext unverständlich ist. Es macht gar nichts, wenn man etwas nicht versteht, nein, gerade so ist es das beste Argument!

Es bleibt das Fazit zu ziehen. Irenäus verfügt über zuverlässige, Valentins "Originalton" einfangende Dokumente. Er tradiert einiges daraus, aber nur zu agitatorischem Gebrauch: er will Valentin lächerlich machen. Dieser ist ihm kein Diskussionspartner. Vor allem teilt er nicht Valentins Ausgangspunkt, dass jeder Mensch sein Gottesverhältnis selbst erkunden müsse und nur im eigenen Innern zu Einsicht und Vollmacht finden könne. Denn für Irenäus ist "Wahrheit" nicht ein erst im Lebensprozess gefundenes, ja errungenes Können und Verhalten, so dass es so viele Wege zu Gott gibt wie es Menschen gibt, sondern für ihn ist Wahrheit eine Summe von Sätzen, die in der Kirche anerkannt sind. "(Und) bezüglich der Erkennbarkeit und des Besitzes der Wahrheit war der Bischof in Gallien sich unbedingt sicher und zweifelsfrei. Die Wahrheit war ihm nämlich auf völlig unproblematische Weise evident, weil Gott sie den Menschen nachweislich mitgeteilt hat. Er meinte, nur auf die Tatsachen verweisen zu müssen, um ein für allemal jede Konkurrenz zur kirchlichen Lehre ausgeschlossen zu haben." (Brox (Anm. 34) 102). Welche Tatsachen das sind, kann jeder am Taufbekenntnis ablesen; *Haer* I 10,1 zählt Irenäus sie in kaskadenhafter Weise auf. Diese Tatsachen lehre jeder christliche Lehrer, der schwach begabte Prediger könne nichts weglassen, der begabte Prediger könne nur Zierrat und Folgerungen zufügen; und alle Ortskirchen unter der Sonne lehrten genau diese Tatsachen.

Irenäus ist ein schrecklicher, aber erfolgreicher Vereinfacher: Was nicht der kirchlichen regula fidei entspricht, muss man denunzieren und lächerlich machen. In dieser Weise verfährt er mit Valentin, er ist durchaus stolz auf seine Leistung. In der Einleitung des 4. Buches seiner "Überführung und Widerlegung der fälschlich sogenannten Gnosis" klopft er sich anerkennend auf die eigene Schulter, wenn er schreibt: "Denn die, die vor uns in dieser Sache tätig waren,—und von denen waren einige durchaus tüchtiger als wir!—konnten doch nicht hinreichend denen widersprechen, die sich von Valentin herleiten. Sie kannten nämlich nicht deren Glaubensmaßstab, den (erst) wir mit größter Sorgfalt im 1. Buch für dich dargelegt haben."[67] Hier bestätigt Irenäus, wie er in *Haer* I 11 (bzw. *Haer* I 1-9)

[67] Irenäus *Haer* IV Praef. 2: "*Quapropter hi, qui ante nos fuerunt, et quidem multo nobis meliores, non tamen satis potuerunt contradicere his qui sunt a Valentino, quia ignorabant regulam ipsorum, quam nos cum omni diligentia in primo libro tibi tradidimus.*" Angeredet ist der (fiktive) Empfänger der als Lehrbriefe stilisierten Bücher, auch der Verweis auf die *meliores ante*

verfuhr: er hat Lehren Valentins (bzw. seiner Schüler) willkürlich herausgesucht und sie (nicht ohne Verfälschungen, besonders der literarischen Gattung) so aufgereiht, dass etwas Ähnliches wie ein "Credo" Valentins (bzw. seiner Tradition) herauskam: es ergibt sich eine Aufstellung von so irrsinnigen und fantastischen Glaubensartikeln, dass dagegen die orthodoxe regula fidei als ein Muster von Einsicht und Vernunft erscheint. So treibt man Demagogie und Agitation. Glücklicherweise verfuhr der Kirchenvater aber meist so simpel, dass man eine ganze Menge dessen, was Valentin formulierte und lehrte, bei Irenäus wiederfinden kann.

D-53127 *Bonn*, Waldauweg 20

---

nos ist vor allem, wenn nicht ausschließlich literarisches Klischee (s. dazu Markschies (Anm. 1) 380 Anm. 307-309).